BT
790
058

The University of Chicago
Libraries

DURRETT COLLECTION

AN ESSAY

ON

REGENERATION.

BY THE RIGHT REV. HENRY U. ONDERDONK, D.D.

ASSISTANT BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Isto modo, quoniam homines mortales sunt, sint aliqui inmortales: et quoniam nascuntur in terra, nascantur et in aqua.

Cic. de Nat. Deor. L. 1. *c.* 39.

. . . . . Pauci, quos . . . .
. . . ardens evexit ad æthera virtus,
Dis geniti . . . . . .

Æneis, L. 6. *v.* 129.

PHILADELPHIA:
JOHN C. PECHIN, 13 SOUTH FOURTH STREET.

.....

1835.

THE LIBRARY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

2334.4
.Om82
BT790
058

WILLIAM STAVELY, PRINTER,
No. 12 Pear Street.

473843

TO THE

CLERGY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN

THE DIOCESES OF PENNSYLVANIA AND DELAWARE,

THIS

ESSAY IS INSCRIBED,

BY

THEIR AFFECTIONATE FRIEND AND BROTHER,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

At an early period of his ministry, and in a remote situation where he had access to but few books, and to almost none of the principal treatises on Baptismal Regeneration, the author of the following pages was compelled to write on that subject. He had been taught that baptism is the only regeneration in this life, and that the moral change from sin to holiness should be termed conversion or renovation; and he had passively imbibed that opinion. His position however as a controvertist, and his want of books, required him now to argue the matter for himself, and to make the chief source of his arguments the Bible, with but little help from commentators and other authorities. Having fulfilled hastily his task, he published, at the close of the year 1818, a dissertation agreeing in doctrine with the present one. In 1832, it was republished, much enlarged, and after deeper reflection than could at first be devoted to it, in the Protestant Episcopalian; and in 1834, with some further additions, in the Churchman. The essay, thoroughly re-examined, is again submitted to the public, in a form yet more expanded, as well as remodelled.

The primary object of the author was, as intimated, to argue the subject of baptismal regeneration; and hence, that of regeneration in the popular or moral sense was not treated largely. Neither is it now; though some further arguments and practical observations are inserted. As little also as possible are those doctrinal points introduced, which are only incidentally connected with the main discussion.

From private communications, and from some public notices, the author has reason to believe that his production has been well received; not of course to the extent of effecting uniformity of opinion, or much approximation to it; yet sufficiently to justify him in devoting further pains to its improvement, and again offering it to notice. From the circumstances under which it was first written, it was an attempt at an *inductive* investigation of the subject, on the basis of scripture; as such an attempt the author still regards it: and if it fail in leading to the certainty produced by that mode of reasoning, the failure must be ascribed to unskilfulness in the execution.

Philadelphia, March, 1835.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, - - - - - - 7

CHAPTER I.

The Change of State—Regeneration.

SECT. 1. Scriptural Proofs, - - - - 15
SECT. 2. Quotations from the Apocrypha, - - 22

CHAPTER II.

The Change of Character—Regeneration.

SECT. 1. Scriptural Proofs. - - - - 24
SECT. 2. Quotations from the Apocrypha, - - 30
SECT. 3. An Objection Answered, - - - 31

CHAPTER III.

Baptismal Regeneration.

SECT. 1. Scriptural Proofs, - - - - 41
SECT. 2. The Authority of the Fathers, - - - 46
SECT. 3. Other Human Authorities, - - - 50
SECT. 4. Further Remarks on Baptismal Regeneration, - 58

CHAPTER IV.

Moral Regeneration.

SECT. 1. Scriptural Proofs, - - - - 65
SECT. 2. The Authority of the Fathers, - - - 73
SECT. 3. The Theory—No Regeneration but in Baptism, 77
SECT. 4. The Theory—that the Grace of Baptismal Regeneration is of a Moral kind, - - 81
SECT. 5. The Theory of the Two Regenerations, - 87
SECT. 6. Moral Regeneration gradual, and capable of Repetition, - - - - - - 96
SECT. 7. Practical Remarks on Moral Regeneration, - 105

CHAPTER V.

The Theory of the Two Regenerations applied to the Standards and Offices of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

SECT. 1. The Standards examined, - - - 114
SECT. 2. The Offices examined, - - - - 122

CONCLUSION, - - - - - - 127

APPENDIX.

Regeneration synonymous with Renovation or New Creation, - - - - - - 131

AN ESSAY ON REGENERATION.

INTRODUCTION.

THE word Regeneration is applied, as are also several kindred expressions, to a certain *change of state*, and to a certain *change of character*. It is a figurative term, founded on the natural birth or begetting of human beings. When either of the changes takes place, the subject of it is said to be born again, new born, begotten again, or regenerated. Our authority for giving the word this twofold signification, is Scripture, in its obvious or just meaning.

The change of *state* alluded to, is the transition from being out of the visible church to being within that body. The change of *character*, is recovery from the dominion of sin to victory over it; and, when combined with the change of state or union with the church, from the curse of sin to pardon.[1]

1 Baptism is the seal of the covenant of pardon through Christ; it is not in itself pardon or remission of sins, for the covenant requires repentance and faith, or the change of character, as conditions. Neither the covenant nor its seal, therefore, positively avail, till the conditions are fulfilled. When both the above changes exist in any person, he is in a state of pardon—which however requires to be persevered in, and to be perfected.

Exception may perhaps be taken to the words *state* and *character*, as used to distinguish these two changes, viz. that there is a change of *outward* character in baptism, and of *inward* state in the recovery from sin, and that they are thus convertible terms. But we request that critical scruples be dispensed with, as is done frequently in theological and other nomenclature, and these expressions allowed as arbitrary designations of the two changes to which we apply the name Regeneration.

That change of *state* which is the transition from being out of the visible church to being within it, is, in the christian church, effected in baptism, and by the Holy Spirit, the minister being his agent. And this operation of the Spirit is, in scripture, called regeneration. Hence, christian baptism consists always of two parts, *washing* performed by the minister, and *regeneration* effected by the Holy Ghost. In every christian baptism, whatever be the personal qualities of the individual baptized, both these parts exist, washing and regeneration.

That change of *character*, which is recovery from the dominion of sin to victory over it, and, when combined with baptism, from its curse to pardon, is ordinarily effected in the use of the means of grace, yet by the Holy Spirit, by his power only; and the change is gradual and progressive. The means of grace are various—union with the visible church; prosperous or adverse dispensations of Providence; pious education; the word of God, whether read in the Bible, or expounded and enforced in preaching, or in religious books or conversation; prayer, in all its branches; solemn benedictions; the sacraments. In baptism, as one of the sacraments, devoutly received by an adult, piety is furthered; and, in both adults and infants, 'grace is increased by virtue of prayer unto God:'[1] this, however, being an

[1] See Article xxvii. On this portion of our Article on Baptism, a few remarks may be made here. 1. Bishop Taylor, in his Sermons, (*V.* 2. *p.* 25,) says, 'baptism is but a prayer, and the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper is but a prayer,' &c. This is rhetorical language. The sacraments are indeed of the nature of prayer, yet also more than prayer; as the outward act of devotion is more than the essence of devotion, which is only in the heart. Each of these outward acts, combined with inward devotion, receives a greater blessing than inward devotion does alone. 2. The 'virtue' of baptism as a 'prayer' or act of devotion, or of the prayers added to the rite, is no more infallible, we presume, than the 'virtue' of other prayers and devotions. Of course the 'increase of grace,' mentioned in the Article, is not an absolutely certain consequence of the reception of that sacrament. 3. This language of the Article affords no countenance, as has been alleged,

element of the change of character, is not to be confounded with the change of state then effected. The operation of the Spirit in producing this change of character is often called, in scripture, *conversion* or turning; it is often called *renovation* or renewing, which word means properly, not mere refreshing, as is commonly imagined, but making anew or *new-creating;* it is also called being born again or *regenerated.* In two passages, the phrase 'born again' is given in the margin 'born from above;'[1] and this latter expression, referring to a birth different from the natural birth, is equivalent to 'born *again* from above,' or 'regenerated from above.' In like manner, 'born of God' means 'born *again* of God'—and 'begotten of God' means 'begotten *again* of God'—both being the same as 'regenerated of God.' The Vulgate has *renatus* in the text, 'except a man be *born* of water, and of the Spirit,' &c.; and though the reading is deemed unauthorized, it gives the true meaning, 'born *again* of water, and of the Spirit,' or 'regenerated of water, and of the Spirit.'

As the term regeneration is applied to both the change of state and the change of character, and as these two changes are neither identical nor similar, we affirm that there are TWO separable and separate regenerations, which we distinguish as *baptismal* regeneration, and *moral* regeneration. The word 'moral' is preferred to 'spiritual,' because regeneration to the change of state is an operation of the Spirit, and therefore *a* spiritual regeneration; as regeneration to the change of character is another operation of the Spirit, and therefore also *a* spiritual regeneration: 'moral' is thus a more perfectly distinctive term than 'spiritual.'

to those who make baptism, or what is conferred in that sacrament, the initiatory point in the moral change, or the germ or seed of moral regeneration. The '*increase*' of [moral] grace in or at baptism, obviously is not the *beginning* of such gracious influences.

[1] John iii. 3, 7.

The phrases 'sons of God,' 'children of God,' and others of like sense, are synonymous with 'born of God' or regenerated, when they imply either the change of state or of character now before us: when used in any other connexion, they have no direct relation to our subject. 'Adoption' is also an equivalent term; it expresses literally what 'born again' expresses metaphorically.[1]

Such are the outlines of the doctrine of Regeneration to be proved, from scripture, in this essay. But before proceeding to detail the proofs, some preliminary observations will be offered.

Our first observation is this: When the doctrine of a baptismal regeneration is denied, its advocates adduce the fact, that the very *word* regeneration, παλιγγενεσια, is applied in scripture to baptism only,[2] not to the change of heart; and the argument is unanswerable in favour of a baptismal new birth. Yet a new birth is *implied* also in the passages which describe the morally changed as born or begotten of God; these expressions meaning, as has been stated, born or begotten again; they recognise a birth after the natural one. The exact phraseology of scripture is clear evidence of a baptismal regeneration; while yet unavoidable inference gives also to the word a moral signification, and applies it to conversion from sin, the creation of the new heart, the holy change of character.

Our next observation is of more importance. We trust it will be perceived that, in the statement of our doctrine, a perfect distinction has been made between baptism and the change of heart. The spiritual operation in each

1 See Pearson on the Creed, *fol. ed.* 1701, *p.* 140.

2 See Tit. iii. 5. In Matt. xix. 28, the only other passage in which the word occurs, there is no clear reference to either change: 'in the regeneration' may there mean 'in the resurrection:' it may also mean, 'in the visible church regenerated by the christian dispensation;' and this latter interpretation gives the word a connexion with baptism.

of them is indeed called regeneration; but it should be remembered, that there are 'diversities of operations of the same Spirit,'[1] and that some of his most conspicuous operations did not include a *moral* effect, as inherent in them. 'Divers kinds of tongues' were a gift of the Spirit; but it was sometimes so abused, as to show that, even when acting with full efficacy, it neither produced nor implied the moral improvement of its possessor; nay, he might be no better than 'sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.' Another gift of the Spirit was 'the working of miracles;' but though a man could thus 'remove mountains,' he was 'nothing' if without the better spiritual qualities. Another gift was 'prophecy;' yet its possessor also might be 'nothing:' and this, not only in the case of inspired preaching, sometimes called prophecy, but in that of predicting future events; for Balaam, who prophesied the coming of Christ, was a bad man; as also was Caiaphas, who prophesied his death. The entire surrender of property into the common stock, during the pentecostal period, and till inspiration ceased, seems to have been the result of another extraordinary operation of the Spirit; but even this might be done, and yet 'profit nothing.'[2] All these effects were produced by 'one and the self same Spirit;' while however another and very different 'operation' was necessary for the *moral* change, for that change of character, in which only, through the Holy Ghost, these endowed persons could be restored from sin to holiness, to 'charity,' or true and effectual love to God and men. It is not probable indeed, that ungodly individuals often received the extraordinary gifts; but the plain import of scripture is that they might, and sometimes did. And the bare possibility of working miracles, &c. without being reclaimed from evil, shows that *these* operations of the Spirit, even when producing their full spe-

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 4, 6. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. xiii. 1, 2, 3. Acts ii. 44. iv. 32.

cific effect, were different from that in which he brings to pass our *moral* change.

The gift of the ministerial office is another endowment of the Holy Ghost, which may, in its completeness, be conferred on men not renewed in the spirit of their minds, and which, when conferred, does not of itself renew them. When our Saviour bestowed this office, at least the highest grade of it, on his Apostles, he said, 'receive ye the Holy Ghost;' and Paul declared to the elders of Ephesus, that 'the Holy Ghost had made them overseers (presbyter bishops) over the flock:' ordination of course confers a *spiritual* gift; and Aaron and the levitical priesthood were separated to their office by anointing, which ceremony implied that their separation was an act of the Spirit, or had his concurrence. But does *this* 'receiving of the Holy Ghost' include, as inherent, a reception also of *moral* grace? Let the conduct of the sons of Eli, and that of many priests while our Saviour was on the earth, answer for the line of Aaron. Let the conduct of Judas, who was long 'a devil,' though a christian minister, that of the early false teachers, and, alas, the experience of every age, answer for the apostolic line.[1] All these bad men received absolutely, from the Holy Spirit, and absolutely possessed, the gift of the ministerial office; but they rejected his converting or moral influences. As Mr. Baxter well remarks, 'all that are ordained to the sacred ministry are relatively holy, as devoted and separated to that office: and the well qualified are also really holy.'[2] In the ministry therefore, we have a perpetual case, proving incontestibly that the Spirit confers on men certain *gifts that are not moral*, in their inherent effect, or specific nature.

All ecclesiastical *privileges* granted to the visible church and its members, are spiritual; but, though they may be

1 John xx. 22. Acts xx. 28. Exod. xl. 13, 15. 1 Sam. ii. 12. John vi. 70. 2 Cor. xi. 13, 15.

2 Baxter's Pract. Works, *fol. V.* 1. *p.* 712.

accompanied with spiritual *influences*, they do not, of necessity, imply the possession of the latter, or any thing more than the offer of them. Thus, in ordination the privilege of office is conferred positively; while the influence of peculiar grace, duly to fulfil the sacred work, is merely offered. The one is a spiritual gift, ecclesiastical only, not moral; the other, when accepted, is, like all the influences from above that improve the character, a moral gift.

Baptismal regeneration is, in our opinion, one of those 'operations' of the Holy Ghost which are *spiritual, but not moral;* and on this position is grounded the whole view of the subject of Regeneration now submitted: it is an ecclesiastical, spiritual *privilege*, not a moral *influence* of the Sanctifier. Though none can develope the mode in which divine influence acts upon the human soul, it will yet be allowed, we presume, that an intelligent being is *sensible* of moral impressions when they are made: 'a correct disposition,' says Bishop White on this subject, 'is a matter of sensibility, which cannot be unknown to the person of whom it is descriptive.'[1] There *is* a perception of holy impressions, as the Spirit effects progressively our moral regeneration; but *no* such perception exists when he effects our baptismal regeneration. This distinction between the two, their affecting or not affecting our sensibility or consciousness, is no mean argument for their being different operations of the Holy Ghost.

Let the reader then be cautioned, expressly, against connecting the popular idea of regeneration with that word as applied, in this essay, to baptism. No moral or converting influences of the Spirit, no formation of a germ, no deposite of a seed, or leaven, intended to become active and result in such influences, or of the same sanctifying nature with them, are here meant in that use of the word; but

[1] 1 Bp. White's Comparison, *V.* 2. *p.* 295.

only the ratifying, ascribed to the Holy Ghost, of our separation from the world to the visible church, and of the grant to us of its privileges, as made in that sacrament. All the practical, converting, morally new-creating influences of the Spirit, and all their elements, we include in the change called moral regeneration.

We now proceed to the SCRIPTURAL PROOFS of the several propositions contained in this introductory statement of our doctrine. As the main proposition, we have asserted that in both the change of *state* and the change of *character*, the person who is the subject is said to be born again, or REGENERATED. We shall examine, therefore, in the first two chapters, the revealed evidence pertaining to each of these heads—also some Apocryphal quotations, which have a bearing on them, as showing that this mode of speaking was common. Further views of the subject will then be presented.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHANGE OF STATE—REGENERATION.

SECTION 1.

SCRIPTURAL PROOFS.

By the change of *state*, or the transition from being out of the visible church to being within that body, we acquire the title born again, born of God, children of God, sons of God, adopted; all which expressions are equivalent to 'regenerated,' as has been shown in the Introduction.[1]

Our first text shall be—'and thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, thus saith the Lord, Israel is my *son*, even my first born: and I say unto thee, let my *son* go, that he may serve me.' All Israel were to go, 'young and old, sons and daughters.'[2] It is of course implied, that all Israel, the whole visible Israelitish church, were 'sons' of God, that is, born of God, or regenerate. It is also implied, that Pharaoh and his people, not in the church, were *not* sons of God in this sense.

In agreement with this language, the Deity declares, 'when Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my *son* out of Egypt:' the primary application of the passage is to the Israelitish church; it has also a secondary application to our Saviour.[3] Moses declares to that church, 'ye are the *children* of the Lord your God.'[4] The same designation is given to that church in the age of the prophets; 'I am a *father* to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born'—'is

[1] See Introd. *p.* 9, 10. [2] Exod. iv. 22, 23, x. 9. [3] Hos. xi. 1. Matt. ii. 15. [4] Deut, xiv. 1.

Ephraim my dear *son*, is he a pleasant *child*'—the sword 'contemneth the rod of my *son*.'[1] It is also thus given in the New Testament; 'the *children* of the kingdom shall be cast out'—'Israelites, to whom pertaineth the *adoption*:' other texts show the once exclusive right of their church to this distinction; 'neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all *children* [of God,] but in Isaac shall thy seed be called'—'they which are the children of the flesh, [Ishmaelites,] these are *not* the children of God: but the children of the promise [of Isaac] *are* counted for the *seed*' of God—let it be particularly noticed, that Abraham's children of the promise, his ecclesiastical progeny, are here declared to be the children of God: this key will explain many other passages in a similar way. The same meaning is allowed by commentators generally in the declaration of our Lord, 'let the *children* first be filled; for it is not meet to take the *children's* bread, and to cast it unto the dogs:' the Jews, as the church, regarded themselves as God's children, and our Saviour recognized their claim.[2] It is evident, from these passages, that a common appellation of the visible church, or its members, is, sons or children of God, in other words, born (again) of God, or regenerate, or, more literally, adopted.

Such appellations are equally given to the christian church visible. St. Paul, speaking of the calling of the Gentiles, quotes the prophecy, 'it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people, there shall they be called the *children* of the living God:'[3] that is, Gentiles, coming into the church, shall thus become, what they were not before, children of God, born of God, or regenerate: the appellation descended from the Israelitish to the christian church, and has the same meaning with us as with them. That apostle applies such language

1 Jer. xxxi. 9, 20. Ezek. xxi. 10. 2 Matt. viii. 12. Rom. ix. 4. 7, 8; (where see Poole's Syn. and Grotius) Mark vii. 27. 3 Rom. ix. 26.

to the Galatians, as of the visible church, not as renewed or consistent christians; for in this latter respect they were so deficient, that he 'travailed in birth of them again until Christ should be formed in them,' he 'stood in doubt of them,' and even intimated that they might 'be fallen from grace.' To such christians as these he writes, 'ye are all the *children* of God by faith in Christ Jesus,' that is, by the faith of a profession made in baptism, which is alluded to in the next verse—again, 'that we might receive the *adoption* of *sons*'—'because ye are *sons*'—'thou art no more a servant, but a *son*'—and again, 'we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the *children* of promise;' and the children of the promise are, as we have already mentioned, the children of God.[1] All these expressions refer to the regeneration of the Galatian converts merely as belonging to the visible church; for, besides that the many rebukes of the apostle show that nothing better was meant, of no congregations, and there were several of them in Galatia, could or can it be said, that '*all*' their members 'are the children of God' in the higher sense.[2] Accordingly, the apostle further declares to them, 'as many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ have put on Christ'—'ye are *all* one in Christ Jesus'—'and if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's *seed*'—elsewhere he says, 'Abraham, who is the *father* of us *all*;' and we have seen that Abraham's seed of the promise are God's seed or children.[3] Thus fully are we assured, by the application of the ecclesiastical designations of the old church to the new, descending from the one to the other, as well as in more direct terms, that 'all' who are baptized,

[1] Gal. iv. 19, 20. v. 4. iii. 26. iv. 5, 6, 7, 28 comp. Rom. ix. 8. [2] Gal. i. 2. 'Ye are *all* the children of light, and the children of the day,' (1 Thess. v. 5,) refers to the profession of christianity, and the knowledge of its truths, as contrasted with the darkness of heathenism. (See Hammond, Poole's Annot. Doddridge, Macknight.) [3] Gal. iii. 27, 28, 29. Rom. iv. 16. ix. 7, 8.

all who are in the church visible, are children of God, adopted, regenerate.

Similar phraseology is applied to even the profession of a false religion, idolatry—'saying to a stock, thou art my *father*, and to a stone, thou hast *brought me forth*,' or, as in the margin, 'thou hast *begotten* me,' that is, hast begotten me *again*,—'ye *sons* of the sorceress.... *children* of transgression, a *seed* of falsehood, enflaming yourselves with idols.'[1] It appears, then, that the profession of any religion may be called a regeneration into that religion; and baptism is the appointed profession of christianity.

Further illustration and proof of our position, that the members of the visible church are, as such, born again, will be found in several of the passages which speak of the church as the spouse of her divine Head. The church regards her members as her children; 'my *children* are gone forth of me, and they are not,' they are dead—'my *children* are desolate, because the enemy prevailed'—yet these are declared by Jehovah to be *his* children, 'thou hast taken thy sons and thy daughters, whom thou hast *borne unto me*, and these hast thou sacrificed.... thou hast slain *my children*'—again, 'the blood of thy *children*'—'thou art thy mother's daughter, that loatheth her husband and her *children*:'[2] though the church be corrupt, the title 'children of God' still belongs to her members. At a better period than that described in these quotations, David both pleads and praises, in his devotions, this covenant filial relation; 'give strength unto thy servant, and save the *son* of thine *handmaid*'—'O Lord, truly I am thy servant, and the *son* of thine *handmaid*; thou hast loosed my bonds:' the 'handmaid' of Jehovah is his spouse, the church.[3] The same allusions occur in Isaiah; 'there is none to guide her among

1 Jer. ii. 27. Isa. lvii. 3, 4, 5. 2 Jer. x. 20. Lam. i. 16. Ezek. xvi. 20, 21. 36. 45: see also Ezek. xxiii. 37. 3 Ps. lxxxvi. 16. cxvi. 16: see Bp. Horne.

all the *sons* whom she hath *brought forth*, neither is there any that taketh her by the hand among all the *sons* that she hath brought up'—'thy *sons* have fainted'—'the *children* which thou shalt have after thou hast lost the *other*'—'who hath *begotten* me these, seeing I have lost my *children*'—'they shall bring thy *sons* in their arms, and thy *daughters* shall be carried upon their shoulders'—'I will save thy *children*'—'thy *sons* shall come from far, and thy *daughters* shall be nursed at thy side.' The children thus given to the church are expressly acknowledged to be God's children, 'I will bring *thy seed* from the east, and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, give up; and to the south, keep not back; bring *my sons* from far, and *my daughters* from the ends of the earth.' Very beautifully is this metaphor enlarged upon, in the passage which represents the 'married' or Jewish church as giving place to the once 'desolate' or Gentile church—'sing, O barren, thou that didst not *bear* . . . . for more are the *children* of the desolate than the *children* of the married wife, saith the Lord: enlarge the place of thy tent, [for the increasing family of God,] . . . . thy *seed* shall inherit the Gentiles . . . . thou shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more: for thy Maker is thine husband, the Lord of hosts is his name . . . . and thy *children* shall all be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy *children*.' St. Paul quotes this prophetic allegory, to the same effect.[1] The phrase, '*children* of Zion,' may be added.[2] And a similar interpretation must be given to at least two other passages—'Jerusalem which is above,' that is, the christian church, called also 'heavenly places,' in which we are 'made to sit' even here—'Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the *mother* of us all'—'so then, brethren, we are *children*

[1] Isa. li. 18, 20. xlix. 20, 21, 22, 25. lx. 4. xliii. 5, 6. liv. 1—5, 13. Gal. iv. 27.
[2] Ps. cxlix. 2. cxlvii. 13. Isa. lxvi. 8. Joel ii. 23.

of the free woman,' or the christian church:[1] with these texts the apostle connects the prophecy, just quoted, which declares, 'thy Maker is thine husband,' and of course the father of thy children.—From these many and clear scriptures we argue, unanswerably we think, that all the members of the visible church are, as being her children, the children of God, born (again) of God, regenerate.

And these appellations belong to the members of the visible church simply as such, simply in virtue of their change of *state*, whether they have the change of character or not, whether they are personally upright or wicked. Most decisive as proofs of this assertion, are the passages which denounce their sins and ungodliness, yet at the same time regard them as continuing in the filial relation to God. 'I have nourished and brought up *children*, and they have rebelled against me . . . . *children* that are corrupters'—'wo to the rebellious *children* . . . . lying *children*, *children* that will not hear the law of the Lord'—'return, [be converted,] ye backsliding *children*'—'thy *children* have forsaken me'—'O foolish people and unwise, is not he thy *Father* that hath bought thee . . . . of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful . . . . he abhorred them, because of the provoking of his *sons* and of his *daughters* . . . . *children* in whom is no faith'—'if then I be a *father*, where is mine honour'—'cursed *children*.'[2] We ask particular notice for the passage, 'turn, [be converted,] O backsliding *children*, for I am married unto you,'[3] to your church: their church, though idolatrous, was still the church—their personal transgressions, though of so great an amount as to require their 'conversion,' did not destroy their privi-

1 Gal. iv. 26, 31: comp. Eph. ii. 6.

2 Isa. i. 2, 4. xxx. 1, 9. Jer. iii. 22. v. 7. Deut. xxxii. 6, 18, 19, 20. Mal. i. 6. 2 Pet. ii. 14. 3 Jer. iii. 14.

lege of being called children of God, or regenerate, as long as they remained the visible covenant body. Their plea, when in captivity for their sins—their plea, founded on this privilege, is prophetically anticipated by Isaiah, 'doubtless thou art our *Father*, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not,' though we are unworthy to be owned by our faithful progenitors, Abraham and Israel —'thou, O Lord, art our *Father*'—and again, 'but now, O Lord, thou art our *Father* .... be not wroth very sore, neither remember iniquity for ever:'[1] as sons of God the prophet regards them, great as was their 'iniquity.' To the same effect is the exclamation of our Saviour, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would *I* have gathered thy *children* together, as a hen doth gather her *brood* under her wings, and ye would not:'[2] the solicitude of the Messiah here expressed is *parental;* yet it is felt and expressed in behalf of the Jews, though killing prophets, stoning God's messengers, and obstinately rejecting this his parental care; and they are recognised as 'children' of Jerusalem, the church, and of course as children of God, or regenerate. Very surely then may we affirm, that this appellation, in the lower sense now unfolded, is wholly irrespective of personal character.

The declaration that Abraham is the 'father' of the christian church, shows that the ecclesiastical designation 'children of God' comes to it from the Jewish body, and means the same as applied to both. Abraham is 'the *father* of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised'—he is 'the *father* of us all'—'they which are of faith, the same are the *children* of Abraham'—'if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's *seed*'—and of course,

[1] Isa. lxiii. 16. lxiv. 8, 9. [2] Luke xiii. 34.

as already shown, 'children of God.' John the Baptist expressly recognises the transition of this ecclesiastical title from the Jews to christians—'think not to say within yourselves, we [as the Jewish church] have Abraham to our *father:* for God is able of these stones [the heathen] to raise up *children* unto Abraham'—God will provide himself other covenant children, if you prove unworthy to remain such.[1]

More scriptural proofs could be found, we suppose, by a more diligent search. Enough however have been adduced, to make as clear as any proposition drawn from holy writ, the assertion, that by the change of *state* which is the transition from being out of the visible church to being within that body, we acquire the appellation born again—born of God, sons or children of God, or of the church, adopted, REGENERATE, being equivalent expressions. We presume also, that if our application of some of the texts be questioned, enough will remain to prove amply our doctrine.

CHAPTER I.—SECTION 2.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE APOCRYPHA.

Consulting the Apocryphal books, we shall find that designating as children of God the members of the visible church, was common. Of this fact they are competent evidence. We introduce therefore, not as pertaining to our argument from scripture, but merely as appended to it, a few passages from these writings.

Judith prays for the temple, as 'the house of the possession of thy *children.*' Artaxerxes, in the apocryphal part of Esther, declares, 'we find that the Jews . . . . be *children* of the most high and most mighty living God.' The

[1] Rom. iv. 11, 16. Gal. iii. 7, 29. Rom. ix. 8. Matt. iii. 9.

book of Wisdom, speaking of God's mercies to Israel, says, 'thou hast made thy *children* to be of a good hope that thou givest repentance for sins; for if thou didst punish the enemies of thy *children* with such deliberation .... with how great circumspection didst thou judge thine own *sons*'—again, speaking of the manna, 'thy sustenance declared thy sweetness to thy *children* .... that thy *children*, O Lord, whom thou lovest might know that it is not the growing of fruits that nourisheth man'—again, speaking of the tyranny of the Egyptians, 'who had kept thy *sons* shut up .... upon the destruction of the first born, they acknowledged this people to be the *sons* of God'—again, speaking of their protection when passing the Red Sea, 'that thy *children* might be kept without hurt.' To the same effect—'Israel is the Lord's portion ... his *first-born*'—'Israel, whom thou hast named thy *first-born*.' In other places we read, 'the *mother* that *bare* them saith unto them, go your way, ye *children*, for I am a widow and forsaken .... go your way, O my *children*, and ask mercy of the Lord'—'the *mother* of these *children*, which would not keep my covenant'—'fear not, thou *mother* of the *children*, for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord'—'Zion our *mother* is full of all heaviness'—'O Jerusalem, the holy city, he will scourge thee for thy *children's* works'—'her own *children* left her.'[1]

We build nothing on these apocryphal extracts; but they certainly are worthy of notice.

[1] Judith ix. 13. Esth. xvi. 15, 16. Wisd. xii. 19, 20, 21. xvi. 21, 26. xviii. 4, 13. xix. 6. Ecclus. xvii. 17. xxxvi. 12. 2 Esd. ii. 2, 4, 5, 17. x. 7. Tob. xiii. 9. 1 Mac. i. 38. See also 2 Esd. ii. and Bar. iv. in many places.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHANGE OF CHARACTER—REGENERATION.

SECTION I.

SCRIPTURAL PROOFS.

THE several appellations we have had before us belong in a higher sense to those persons who have undergone the sanctifying change of *character*, to those who, from the dominion and the curse of sin, under which all men are by nature, are recovered to victory over sin, and, if in the church, to pardon. All the passages of scripture which apply the expressions 'born of God, children of God,' &c. to persons of an improved moral and pious standing, belong to this head of our subject, and are to be interpreted of their *moral* regeneration. The passages also which give those appellations to the saints in the resurrection,[1] might perhaps be added, as in part of a kindred signification; but, to save gratuitous discussion, we omit them.

As our first proof that moral regeneration is distinct from the regeneration of mere church-membership, we cite the passage in which the Jews allege, 'we have one *Father*, even God,' and our Saviour replies, 'if God were your *Father*, ye would love me.'[2] The Jews were right in one sense; they were 'children of God,' being Abraham's 'children of the promise,' to whom 'pertained the adoption;' being also the 'children' of Jerusalem, the church,

1 Such as Luke xx. 36: see also 2 Esd. ii. 41. 2 John viii. 41, 42.

the spouse of God.[1] But our Saviour directs them to a higher meaning of the language; there was a sense in which God was *not* their Father, in which they were *not* his children; such they could not be, in this better sense, without 'loving' Christ; nor could they love him without repentance, faith, and obedience, or the change of heart. He thus declares the necessity of *moral* regeneration, as distinguished from the lower regeneration of a church estate—adding the significant rebuke, 'why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word'[2]—it required a spiritual mind, such as none have but the morally regenerate, to comprehend this doctrine.

To the same effect, our Saviour distinguished the 'Pharisees and lawyers,' the 'men of that generation,' Jews, who 'rejected the counsel of God,' delivered by him, yet who were ecclesiastically children of God, from the 'children of Wisdom,' or the sons of God in the moral sense—'Wisdom is justified of all her *children*.'[3] The reviling Jews were sacramentally regenerate; but *morally* so they were not.

When Zaccheus manifested his penitence and holy dispositions, our Lord declared, 'this day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a *son* of Abraham,'[4] that is, as already explained, a son of God. It is allowed by commentators that Zaccheus was a Jew, and thus a son of Abraham, or of God, in the visible church. But had this been the meaning of our Saviour, salvation should have come to his house before his conversion as much as after it, and to all the Jews as much as to him. The proper interpretation is, that this blessing was granted because he had now become the son of Abraham or of God in the higher sense, and was *morally* regenerate. Again

1 Rom. ix. 7, 8, 4. Luke xiii. 34. 2 John viii. 43. 3 Luke vii. 30, 31, 35. 4 Luke xix. 9.

therefore, we find our Lord distinguishing the regeneration to holiness of character, from the regeneration of mere church-membership.

In the parable concerning the wheat and the tares, our Saviour calls the former 'the *children* of the kingdom' or church; yet the latter, 'they which do iniquity,' are also declared to be in that 'kingdom,' till 'gathered out' of it.[1] Here then is a fourth instance of his using expressions equivalent to children of God, in a higher sense than that in which it is applied to 'all' in the kingdom of the Gospel—a fourth instance of his discriminating very explicitly between *moral* regeneration and the new birth to a church estate.

On the same principle we must interpret the language of Moses, in his parting song already quoted from. In one verse, he says of the Israelites, when forsaking God, 'their spot is not the spot of his *children*,' or, as in the margin, 'they are *not* his children'—yet in the next verse he exclaims, 'is not he thy *Father* that hath bought thee,' and soon after, 'of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful.'[2] It is obvious that the relation of sonship to God is here recognised to be of two kinds, the one founded on belonging to the visible church, the other on serving God faithfully. The latter is *moral* regeneration; of the want of which Moses accuses the Israelites generally, though they were 'begotten' of their 'Rock' ecclesiastically.

Equally to our purpose is an exhortation of St. Paul to the Corinthians. These brethren were children of God in the ecclesiastical sense, having been made such in baptism. Yet, when he would dissuade them from being 'unequally yoked together with unbelievers,' he declares, as an encouragement, that they would thus *become* the children of God, of course in a higher sense. 'Wherefore,

[1] Matt. xiii. 38, 41. [2] Deut. xxxii. 5, 6. 18.

come out from among them .... and I will be a *Father* unto you, and ye shall be my *sons* and my *daughters*, saith the Lord Almighty. Having therefore these *promises*, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves .... perfecting holiness in the fear of God.'[1] Here then we have—1. the Corinthian church baptismally regenerate—and 2. the same Corinthians advised to come out from among unbelievers, and 'cleanse' themselves, and perfect their 'holiness,' that God *might be* their Father, and they his sons and daughters—in other words, that, improving the grace they already had, they might become *morally* regenerate; or rather, as we shall see hereafter, that their moral regeneration might be more complete, their 'holiness' more 'perfect.' Their moral regeneration, or its increase, they were taught to regard as one of God's 'promises' to them; and a regeneration *promised* to the baptized cannot be baptismal regeneration, which they already possess.

Other proofs may be added. 'In the fear of the Lord is strong confidence; and his *children* shall have a place of refuge:' the parallelism makes the 'children of the Lord' to be those who 'fear' him; and such fear, or holy reverence, indicates *moral* regeneration. 'As the apple-tree among the trees of the wood, so is my Beloved among the *sons*:' none but the pious, or *morally* regenerate, we may presume, belong to that class of the sons of God, among whom precedence is thus claimed for Christ; the 'brethren among whom he is thus the first-born' are those who are, and will be more fully in the resurrection, 'conformed to his image.' The psalmist declares, if he should argue that God was indifferent concerning virtue and vice, or took no discriminating notice of them, inasmuch as the wicked often prosper and the good are often afflicted—'if I say I will speak thus, behold, I should offend against the

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 14, 17, 18. vii. 1.

generation of thy *children*,' the godly, the *morally* regenerate, who disallow such unworthy constructions of God's providence. Similar, as applicable to the *moral* new birth, are these other passages—'the precious *sons* of Zion, comparable to fine gold'—'the Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was *born* there,' in Zion: when the book of life shall be 'written up,' or finally corrected, by having the names of the wicked 'blotted out,' *moral* regeneration acquired in Zion, the church, will be accounted very different from the regeneration of mere visible membership, which those blotted out had once possessed, as well as those retained in that book.[1]

In the sermon on the mount, our Lord says, 'blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the *children* of God'—'love your enemies, bless them, do good to them, pray for them, that ye may be the *children* of your Father which is in heaven'—and elsewhere, 'love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, &c. and ye shall be the *children* of the Highest.' St. Paul admonishes christians to 'do all things without murmurings and disputings, that they may be blameless and harmless, the *sons* of God, without rebuke.' St. John declares, 'every one that doeth righteousness is *born* of him'—'every one that loveth is *born* of God'—'whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is *born* of God.' St. Peter exhorts, 'as obedient *children*, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance'—'seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit . . . . see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible'—'laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and

[1] Prov. xiv. 26. Song ii. 3; comp. Rom. viii. 29. Ps. lxxiii. 15. Lam. iv. 2. Ps. lxxxvii. 6; comp. Ps. lxix. 28: Ezek. xiii. 9: Rev. iii. 5: xx. 12: xxi. 27.

envies, and all evil speakings, as *new born* babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby.'[1] Surely the new birth which has these tokens—peace-making, forgiving and loving enemies, doing good to them and others, pious contentment, doing righteousness, divine love, faith, obedience and the abandonment of former lusts, the purifying of the soul in obeying the truth through the Spirit, laying aside all evil dispositions and conversations—surely the new birth which has *these* tokens, must be different from that new birth which is ascribed to the baptised indiscriminately, 'ye are *all* the children of God'—'Abraham is the father of us *all*'—'Jerusalem is the mother of us *all*.' Such tokens indicate the *moral* regeneration which is *not* possessed by all the members of the church.

View some kindred passages in another light. 'Whosoever is *born* of God doth not commit sin,' habitually and deliberately: the converse must also be true, 'whosoever commits sin, habitually and deliberately, is *not* born of God,' in the sense here intended, though he *is* born of God in the lower sense, as a member of the visible church. Again, 'whosoever is *begotten* of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not;' he habitually maintains his guard, and is watchful, as a christian soldier, so that Satan does not wound him: the converse of this assertion, equally true, is, that 'whosoever is *not* thus vigilant, but habitually surrenders to that wicked one, is *not* begotten of God,' as the apostle here means, though he *is* ecclesiastically regenerate.[2] How *perfectly* distinguished from the baptismal, is the *moral* new birth!

[1] Matt. v. 9, 44, 45. Luke vi. 35. Phil. ii. 14, 15. 1 John ii. 29. iv. 7. v. 1. 1 Pet. i. 14, 22, 23. ii. 1, 2. On the latter passage it may be remarked, that as 'babes' do not desire the 'word,' that designation cannot, even primarily, signify here infants proper, but means infants figurative, christian disciples 'new born' of God.

[2] 1 John iii. 9. v. 18.

CHAPTER II.—SECTION 2.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE APOCRYPHA.

The Apocryphal books have shown that it was common to designate members of the visible church as children of God, or of Zion. They attest also the usage of giving such appellations to the godly, as distinguished from others in the church.

Of Jacob and Juda, the church, and sons of God in that relation, it is said, 'have I not prayed you .... that ye would be my *children*, and I should be your *Father*:' those who were already God's children, are prayed to *become* his children, of course in the higher or *moral* sense. The appellation is given also to the departed righteous, not yet 'children of the resurrection,' 'remember thy *children* that sleep, for I shall bring them out of the sides of the earth, and show mercy unto them.' In the book of Wisdom, the ungodly say, 'let us lie in wait for the righteous, because he is not for our turn, and is clean contrary to our doings .... he calleth himself the *child* of the Lord .... for if the just man be the *son* of God, he will help him.' Speaking of the escape of those Israelites who looked towards the brazen serpent, a type of Christ, while other Israelites perished—'but thy *sons* not the very teeth of venomous dragons overcame:' the Israelites destroyed and those healed being both children of God, or regenerate, as members of the visible church, the higher regeneration must here be meant: The faith of these 'sons' of God appears to be recognized in the previous verses, where the brazen serpent lifted up is called 'a sign of salvation,' and it is said, 'he that turned himself towards it was not saved by the thing that he saw, but by thee, that art the Saviour of all.' The son of Sirach writes, 'be as a father unto the

fatherless .... so shalt thou be as the *son* of the Most High'—again, 'Wisdom exalteth her *children*,' Wisdom being one of the appellations of one or more of the Divine Persons—and again, 'I [Wisdom] am the mother of fair love, and fear, and knowledge, and holy hope: I therefore, being eternal, am given to all my *children* which are named of him:' in other words, all these children of Wisdom, receiving by her love, fear, knowledge, and holy hope, are *morally* regenerate.[1]

Though apocryphal quotations add nothing material to the argument, they at least tend to confirm our interpretation of the scriptures we have adduced.

CHAPTER II.—SECTION 3.

AN OBJECTION ANSWERED.

Should it be objected to the *two-fold* regeneration we have maintained, the one baptismal, the other moral, that the passages of scripture we have claimed for the higher change, though descriptive of holy qualities, refer all to persons belonging to the visible church, and may be understood merely of what is necessary to *make good* the appellation, child of God, or regenerate, as given them on entering the church—should it be objected, in other words, that baptism and godliness are component and essential parts of *one* regeneration—the sacramental change being regeneration in only an imperfect or contingent sense, and requiring holy and virtuous character, either at or after baptism, to make it actual and positive regeneration, at least

[1] 2 Esd. i. 28, 29. ii. 31. Wisd. ii. 12, 13, 18., xvi. 10, 6, 7. Ecclus. iv. 10, 11. xxiv. 18.

in adults—we have several answers to the objection. And we think they will prove that ecclesiastical regeneration is *totally distinct* from the change to a new heart and life, or moral regeneration; and of course that the latter is *totally distinct* from the former. We ask the reader's kind attention and patience.

As to the presumptive argument: It may perhaps be alleged, that as both the baptismal and the moral changes have the one *name* regeneration, they must be *presumed* to be only two constituent parts of *one* spiritual change. But this does not follow. The name children of God is given to magistrates, as such; of Israelitish judges, already children of God as belonging to the church, it is said, that as rulers also they were 'all *children* of the Most High:'[1] here are two senses of that one appellation, ecclesiastical sonship and official sonship; the former, common to all Israel, not implying the latter, which was enjoyed by only a few of them: why not then allow the twofold sense of the appellation in regard to ecclesiastical sonship and moral sonship? the burden of proof lies upon the objector. Again: the phrases mentioned are applied to the risen saints, '*children* of God, being the children of the resurrection'—'the *adoption*, to wit, the redemption of our body;'[2] and it is allowed, perhaps by all, that this regeneration or adoption, that of the glorified saint, is different from the baptismal regeneration or adoption of the saint on earth: where then is the presumptive argument, against the distinction we have made, arising from there being but one name for the two changes? why not make the regeneration of baptism and the regeneration to a new heart as perfectly distinguishable, as the regeneration of visible earthly saintship and the regeneration of heavenly

1 Ps. lxxxii. 6. 2 Luke xx. 36. Rom. viii. 23. See also Matt. xiii. 43. Rev. xxi. 7. 2 Esd. ii. 41. Wisd. v. 5.

saintship? the burden of proof lies as before. Further argument to the same effect may be found in our Saviour's being called the Son of God in various senses; as the only begotten or the eternal Son, as conceived of the Holy Ghost, as heir of all things, as inducted into his priestly office, as raised from the dead;[1] five kinds of sonship, yet all expressed by one name, or set of names: is it not then nugatory, to allege the presumptive argument mentioned against baptism and the new heart being distinct sonships, distinct regenerations? Every one knows, indeed, that it is not uncommon for scriptural, like many secular words, to have several meanings: the words angel and God are applied to the Deity, to created spirits, and to men; and the word elder, to both civil and sacred officers, and to all the grades of the latter; the context, or other applicable scriptures, deciding who or which is meant in each case; and surely the context and other applicable scriptures show as fully a different sense of the word regeneration and its synonymes, when connected with baptism, from their sense when connected with godly character, as they do in the several uses of the words angel, god, and elder. We dismiss therefore the presumptive argument before us, as having no good foundation.

To proceed to the argument proper: We think it a *petitio principii* to allege that the unworthy are not absolutely regenerated in baptism, or till they add piety to their sacramental standing. For, though some texts may be interpreted on that theory, they may as well be interpreted on the other, that of the two regenerations we have mentioned, and to claim a preference for either opinion, without further proof, is obviously begging the question. Let us look then to the further proof. There is no

[1] John i. 14. Luke i. 35. Ps. ii. 7. Heb. i. 5; v. 5. Acts xiii. 33. Rom. i. 4.

scripture which declares expressly that church-membership without godliness is not regeneration; unless it be *taken for granted* that there is only the one regeneration, not the two. But there *are* scriptures which recognise the regeneration of a mere church estate, independently of holy character. We have seen that 'all' who are baptized are declared to be 'children of God;' the declaration being positive, and not to be qualified without assuming the point in question: and as it is agreed that not all the baptized are pious, it follows that persons may be regenerated in baptism without piety; such a conclusion is unavoidable, if we would preserve from extenuation this absolute assertion of scripture: it also follows, that the passages which make holy qualities essential to regeneration, must be interpreted of another change, so distinct from the baptismal, that the latter can exist, in its entireness, without the former; and this brings us to the *two* regenerations we have described. We have likewise seen, that the appellation 'children' of God is expressly given to members of the church, who, in the same sentence, are as expressly declared to be 'rebellious, corrupters, abhorred of God, unworthy of Abraham and Israel, cursed'—as expressly rebuked for 'backsliding,' and warned to be 'converted,' and accused of 'killing the prophets,' and 'stoning' God's messengers: most surely then, if all this denunciation proves not that that appellation has a full sense irrespective of holy character, we must impute fallacy and uncertainty to the clear language of scripture. That full sense is the regeneration of mere church-membership, which in the christian church is baptismal regeneration. And when virtue and piety are made the tokens of being 'born of God,' *another* regeneration is recognised, moral regeneration, wholly distinct from the former. The theory of two distinct regenerations takes nothing for granted, but rests on an inductive investigation of scripture; while

that of only the one mentioned is, we think, entirely dependent on the assumption that neither of the two changes is of itself a new birth. Our proofs have shown that this high designation belongs to each of them separately.

Further: That all baptized infants are regenerate, is allowed by those with whom we now argue. In their case at least, therefore, regeneration is independent of personal character, infants having none in any proper sense; in the language of scripture, they have 'done neither good nor evil.' And if in them the baptismal new birth is complete without godliness, it must be so in all: or else, there must be *two* kinds of *baptismal* regeneration, the one requiring both baptism and piety, the other, baptism alone. This latter is the view taken in effect, though verbally disclaimed, by many of those who allow only the one regeneration mentioned; but it seems an inconsistent opinion. We therefore prefer making, in reality as well as in words, only one kind of baptismal regeneration, and regarding it, in adults as in infants, as being complete in the performance of the sacrament, and thus perfectly distinct from the moral change; which also, it has been proved, is in scripture called a regeneration.

Others, again, modify the opinion just rejected. They maintain that baptism is regeneration when there is nothing in the person receiving it to prevent its being such; that in infants there is no obstacle; but that unworthiness in adults defeats the regenerating efficacy of the sacrament, or postpones it till their unworthy character is changed. To this theory, however, we find opposed the many scriptures, already quoted, which fully recognise bad persons as children of God, merely in virtue of their church estate, and which thus decide that wickedness does *not* prevent their being regenerated in baptism. This scriptural disproof we regard as final. We would further suggest, however, that this theory, instead of making god-

liness a product of the grace of regeneration, appears to make regeneration a result of godliness: whereas, it is clearly declared, that the godly change of character, personal holiness, is the fruit of the grace of the new birth. Take the strong assertion, 'he cannot sin, *because* he is born of God.' Take other passages, 'whosoever is born of God sinneth not;' obviously *because* he is born of God —'he that is begotten of God keepeth himself;' plainly *because* he is begotten of God. But this theory would reverse the sequence, and say, 'he is born of God, because he cannot, or does not sin,' his reformation has allowed his baptismal regeneration to take effect.[1] We cannot but think the doctrine of two distinct regenerations far preferable to that which leads, or seems to lead, to such a result. We believe that the baptismal new birth is always complete at the font; and that holiness of character is the consequence, the fruit, of the grace which produces the moral new birth. And we say further, on the strength of this last proposition, that a pious adult coming to baptism has the moral new birth, of which his piety is the fruit, before he has the baptismal—another proof, based on scripture, that the two are distinct.—Perhaps however it will here be objected, that we suppose the theory faulted to imply, that regeneration is an *influence*, a seed at least of

1 1 John iii. 9; v. 18. Sometimes indeed this mode of speaking is not adhered to, as 'love your enemies . . . do good . . . *that* ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven:' but the meaning is, 'that ye may *approve* yourselves his children—that ye may show that regenerating grace has taken effect.' In the theory however before us, regeneration is considered as taking place only when the impediment is removed, sinful character, which obstructed it in baptism; of course it is not regeneration that removes the impediment. So it appears to us. If this however be denied, and it be held that the regeneration of the unworthy does not take effect at baptism, yet that regenerating grace does act in producing their subsequent change of character, then it acts *before* that change, and thus their unworthiness when at the font was *not* the impediment supposed: which result is fatal to the theory.

moral grace, for producing a moral effect, when it is rather held to be only a *privilege*—if this objection be raised, we ask, in what sense are the passages just quoted from St. John to be understood? Will it be said that a person cannot or does not sin, 'because' he has the privilege of being in the church, or in the covenant, or in a state of pardon? or 'because' he has made that privilege availing, by forsaking sin thus far? Yet this must be said, if there is not a moral change, the grace of which is an influence yielding holy fruit, to which that apostle alluded when he spoke of being 'born of God.' It is the gracious influence producing, sustaining, and increasing moral regeneration, that opposes sin. This appears to us rational as well as scriptural. While to say, in effect, that a person cannot or does not sin, 'because' he is baptized, is to make an assertion which may perhaps stand in the letter, but not without explaining away the natural and obvious sense. And this difficulty is of peculiar force in the case of adults who were baptized in infancy—when they are allowed to have been baptismally regenerated.

We add to the arguments now given, a *direct* scriptural proof that persons not in the church may be (morally) regenerate. It should however be remembered, that the bible says little of the possible favour with the Deity of those who belong not to his covenant society: we only read some general assertions respecting them; as, that those who have not the law, are a law unto themselves, by the light of nature and tradition; that Christ tasted death for every man; and that he lighteth every man that cometh into the world. We are not to expect, therefore, a clear statement of the relations of such persons with the Holy Spirit. Yet we are not without intimations on the subject. When the Jewish high priest 'prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation,' he added, 'and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in

one the *children of God* that were scattered abroad'[1] This refers to the Gentiles, who were not Jewish children of God, and none of whom had become children of God by initiation into the christian church. Yet 'children of God' they were; and it could have been in no other sense, we think, than as being morally regenerate. Dr. Hammond says—'the sons of God that are scattered abroad, that is, all that are or shall be pious faithful servants of his all the world over, that are qualified aright for the receiving of Christ when he preacheth to them.'[2] It follows that persons may be regenerate before baptism, before they are 'gathered together in one,' into the one visible church; men may be morally regenerate before they are baptismally regenerate. And we have largely proved, that persons may be baptismally or ecclesiastically regenerate while they are not godly or morally regenerate. The unavoidable result is, that there are two *distinct* regenerations.

A very clear recognition of the distinction between baptism and the moral new birth is found in the first epistle to the Corinthians. Of these brethren, generally, St. Paul declares that '*he* had *begotten* them in Christ Jesus through the gospel;' yet he had reminded them, just before, that he 'baptized none of them, but Crispus and Gaius . . . . and the household of Stephanas.'[3] If this 'begetting,' or

1 John xi. 52.

2 Hammond on 1 John iii. 10. *note* d. To the same effect is the passage, 'other *sheep* I have, which are not of this fold:' sheep of Christ there were, not in the Jewish fold, nor as yet in any fold; and the sheep of God's pasture are often identified with his 'people;' and his people are identified with his 'children,' 'surely they are my *people*, *children* that will not lie.' Hence, to be sheep of Christ is to be children of God; yet not here in the ecclesiastical sense, for those mentioned are declared not to be in the 'fold.' They were morally his children or regenerate, while yet unconnected with his church.—See John x. 16. Ps. xcv. 7: c. 2. Isa. lxiii. 8: and also Hammond on John x. *note* a, and on John vi. *note* d.

3 1 Cor. iv. 15. i. 14, 16. In Acts xviii. 8, we learn that 'many of the Corinthians were baptized,' all who 'believed;' but not by Paul himself.

bringing into the relation of sons of God, refer to the conversion of the Corinthians, by Paul, to christianity, before they were baptized, then we have another scriptural assertion of the existence of moral regeneration without the ecclesiastical. Or, if this 'begetting' was the result of pastoral instruction subsequent to their baptism, still their baptismal regeneration and their moral regeneration came through different human agents; the former *not* by Paul, the latter *by* Paul. Adopt either interpretation, and we have proof positive that baptism is not, of itself, the beginning of the spiritual life, or the implanting of a spiritual germ, or the vehicle of spiritual vitality: also, proof positive that there is a regeneration 'through the gospel' besides the sacramental one: and further, proof positive that the two regenerations are so *perfectly distinct*, each from the other, that they were in this case, as they often are, effected through the agency of different ministers. We cannot see how, in view of the premises, these conclusions can be evaded.

We are gratified in seeing our argument in this commanding position, on two accounts—first, because the doctrine presents a clear and intelligible view of this department of revealed truth—and secondly, because it most explicitly warns the careless member of the church, that his being baptized does not imply that he has the new heart, in any degree whatever, or in any whatever of its elements. Far from us however be the thought, that moral regeneration may be supposed to exist, or to remain, in those who *wilfully reject* baptism—we speak not of ignorance, or of involuntary error of any kind—but, these apart, the *wilful* rejection of any appointment of Christ's can be reckoned nothing less than unjustifiable presumption, perverse disobedience. It indicates the most awful presumption and perverseness, to reject knowingly the sealed covenant, into which God requires us to enter, if we

would apply to ourselves any of the clear promises or express encouragements of scripture. And this *wilful* setting at nought a divine commandment renders void, in sound human judgment, the claim of being morally regenerate. As Augustine says—'Conversion of the heart, though it may be where baptism is not had, cannot be where it is contemned: for that is by no means to be called a conversion of the heart to God, where the sacrament of God is contemned.'[1]

[1] Aug. contra Don. *l.* 4: see Wall, 3d *edit. V.* I. *p.* 189.

CHAPTER III.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

SECTION 1.

SCRIPTURAL PROOFS.

We asserted, in the Introduction, that the change of state which is the transition from being out of the visible church to being within that body, is, in the christian church, effected in baptism; a washing with water being performed by the minister; and regeneration, baptismal regeneration, being superadded by the Holy Spirit; and that all who are thus washed are thus regenerated. Some of these propositions have mingled with the argument already given; but it is proper to state them explicitly, and, as thus stated, prove them from scripture.

Baptism introduces us into the visible church: for the visible church is the 'body of Christ,' and '*baptized* into Christ,' '*baptized* into Jesus Christ,' are the same as baptized into the body of Christ. It is said also, 'they that gladly received his word were *baptized*, and the same day there were added unto them [the church] about three thousand souls.' To the same effect—'*baptized* into one body.'[1]

Baptism is to be performed by a christian minister, according to the rule declared in scripture, that the priest-

[1] Eph. i. 22. Gal. iii. 27. Rom. vi. 3. Acts ii. 41; comp. 47. 1 Cor. xii. 13.

hood is 'ordained for men in *things pertaining to God.*' Hence its administration was committed to the apostles, and the apostolic line, 'go *ye*, teach all nations, baptizing them .... and lo, I am with *you* alway, even unto the end of the world.' And it is performed with water; 'see, here is *water*, what doth hinder me to be baptized?'—'can any man forbid *water*, that these should not be baptized?'[1]

There is also in christian baptism an operation of the Holy Spirit, 'by one *Spirit* are we all baptized into one body.' The appellation 'children of *God*,' given to 'all' the baptized, has the same bearing; it means children of God by the Holy Spirit. So likewise, when it is not only said, that 'God hath set in the church apostles, and prophets, and teachers,' but it is also said, 'now hath *God* set the *members every one of them* in the body,' the agency of the Spirit in baptism, as well as in ordination, is recognised. Thus again, the apostle declares the 'children of promise,' of 'all' whom 'Jerusalem is the mother,' in other words, the members of the visible christian church, the 'children of the free woman,' the baptized—the apostle declares them to be 'born of the *Spirit.*' Hence, this operation of the Holy Ghost, in the sacrament of the font, is called regeneration or a new birth: hence the name of this rite is not 'washing' merely, but, to distinguish it from ordinary ablutions, 'the washing of *regeneration;*' hence also, in the use of the baptismal water, we are '*born* of water,' that is, this birth being different from the natural one, 'born *again* of water,' or '*new* born of water.'[2] That all the baptized are thus baptismally regenerated, is evident from passages already cited, 'ye are *all* the children of God'—'Jerusalem is the mother of us *all*'—'we are *all* baptized by one Spirit.'

[1] Heb. v. 1. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Acts viii. 36; x. 47.

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 13. Gal. iii. 26. 1 Cor. xii. 28, 18. Gal. iv. 29, and context. Tit. iii. 5. John iii. 5.

Under this head of the discussion, it is proper to defend that construction of the phrases 'washing of regeneration,' 'born (again) of water,' which applies them to baptism, and which is their natural sense, as well as that in which the early Fathers understood them, as we shall see. These are good rules of interpretation, and not to be disregarded but for very cogent reasons. Yet by many divines they are set at nought, and it is held that the expressions refer to a *merely* spiritual work, which is not baptism, and scarcely if at all connected with that rite. Some of these maintain that the language is wholly figurative; the 'washing' and the 'water' meaning the Spirit, by a direct metaphorical construction: but this is only a supposition, gratuitous, not susceptible of proof; and the simple contradiction of such an opinion is as valid as the assertion of it. To prove language to be figurative, it must be shown that its literal sense is absurd, or otherwise incongruous, which cannot be alleged of these passages, without *taking for granted* that it is absurd or incongruous to connect a regeneration with baptism; and that is begging the question.[1] Others reach the same point by asserting that, in each of the passages, 'washing of regeneration, *and* renewing of the Holy Ghost,' 'born (again) of water, *and* of the Spirit,' the word 'and' is exegetical, meaning 'that is,' and making the former clause in each passage equivalent to the latter—the washing of regeneration, equivalent to the renewing of the Holy Ghost—born again of water, equivalent to born again of the Spirit. Here again, however, we reply that the construction is gratuitous. For it

[1] T. Hartwell Horne says—'The most simple sense is always that which is the genuine meaning'—'we should be more willing to take a sense from scripture than to bring one to it'—'the plain, obvious, and literal sense of a passage .... is ordinarily to be preferred to the figurative sense, and it is not to be rashly abandoned, unless absolute and evident necessity require such literal sense to be given up.' (*V.* 2. *p.* 525, 526, 527: *Lond.* 1821.)

would be quite as logical to reverse this exegetical interpretation, and say that to be born of the Spirit is only to be born of water, and to be renewed by the Holy Ghost is only to submit to the washing of regeneration; the water may as well exclude the Spirit from these passages, as the Spirit the water: and when a hypothetical construction and its opposite thus neutralise each other, neither can be sound. This exegetical exposition, also, is contrary to the rule, that such interpretations are not allowable till they are shown to be necessary. It must be proved that washing and renewing, water and the Spirit, are, or must be, not may possibly be, equivalent terms, and in these particular texts, before the word 'and' be construed exegetically, and made to signify 'that is:' but this has never been proved, and we do not believe that it ever will or can be, since it can only be argued by *taking for granted* that there is no regeneration or new birth in the sacrament of baptism. It is idle, worse than idle, to contend for such exegetical constructions on the ground of mere doctrinal fancies or assumptions, and before the necessity for them is demonstrated. The unlearned may be bewildered by such hypotheses, nay the learned also, and proselytes may be gained; but they obstruct the sound interpretation of the word of God.[1]

As this exegetical interpretation of the two assages before us, is the principal, though but plausible, evasion of their bearing on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, a

1 'I hold for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred scripture,' says Hooker, 'that where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art, which changeth the meaning of words, as alchymy doth or would do the substance of metals, maketh of any thing what it listeth, and bringeth in the end all truth to nothing. Or howsoever such voluntary exercise of wit might be borne with otherwise; yet in places which usually serve, as this doth concerning regeneration by water and the Holy Ghost, to be alleged for grounds and principles, less is permitted.'—(*B.* V. *sect.* 59.)

few more remarks may be added. We appeal to every candid and impartial mind, whether the mass of scriptural proofs contained in our first chapter, showing that mere membership in the visible church confers the appellation sons of God, children of God, equivalent to born again of God or regenerate, but not implying the moral change, does not infinitely outweigh all that can be said in favour of the exegetical sense of the word 'and' in those two passages. The only valid argument for it would be their incongruity with other passages, or with the general tone of scripture, without that interpretation. But we have shown, by a large array of texts, that the bible fully and extensively recognises the regeneration of visible church-membership; and thus the whole argument, if argument it can be called, for the exegesis in question, is overturned and extruded. Nay more; were that exegesis conceded, there would still remain scriptures enough to prove, independently of those two passages, that there is such a regeneration. In a position thus doubly protected, our doctrine is, we think, unassailable.

How entirely gratuitous is the exegetical construction in either of these two passages, will appear by comparing the views given of them by Calvin and Doddridge. Calvin denies this construction in one of the texts, but asserts it in the other; interpreting them respectively—'the washing of regeneration, *and* renewing of the Holy Ghost'—'born of water, *that is*, of the Spirit:' nay, he connects *both* regeneration and renewing with baptism, 'the washing of regeneration and renewing.' Doddridge gives precisely the reverse—'the washing of regeneration, *that is*, the renewing of the Holy Ghost'—'born of water, *and* of the Spirit;' he as strenuously argues against associating regeneration with baptism, as Calvin is clear for connecting both regeneration and renewing with that sacrament. The one divine makes the former text refer decidedly to bap-

tism, and the latter not; while the other divine makes the latter refer to that rite, and the former not, as decidedly as his argument will allow.[1] What an humiliating example of the inconsistency into which learned and pious men may be betrayed by their theories!

CHAPTER III.—SECTION 2.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE FATHERS.

Our appeal to scripture, in proof of the doctrine of a regeneration to the church estate effected in the christian church by baptism, has, we trust, placed that doctrine beyond the reach of fair controversy. This being done, we introduce some extracts from the Fathers, to show that the connexion of regeneration with baptism was also the doctrine of the primitive church. First, however, we remind the reader that some of the fathers use the words, renewed, new formed or created, and the like, as synonymous with regenerate, and often apply them indiscriminately to

[1] And yet Dr. Doddridge has this paragraph—'After all then, if any argument can be deduced from scripture in favour of the manner of speaking now in debate, it must be from the general tenor of it; according to which it seems that all who are members of the visible church are spoken of as regenerate; from which it may be inferred, with some plausible probability at least, that baptism, by which they are admitted into that society, may be called *Regeneration*: and I am ready to believe, as I hinted above, that this was the chief reason why the ancients so often used the word in the sense I am now opposing.' Dr. D. allows that scripture speaks of all the members of the visible church as 'regenerate,' but, because he disapproved of the 'sense' given the word by the writers he was 'opposing,' he would set aside the use of the expression.—See Calvin and Doddridge on Tit. iii. 5, and John iii. 5: see also Calv. Instit. translated by Allen, *V.* 3. *p.* 327, 330, 373; and Doddr. on Regen. *Postscript*, *p.* xv. *&c.*

baptism.[1] We also apprise him, that it is not uncommon for the fathers to regard the moral and the baptismal as one regeneration, and connected with the sacramentof the font: we adduce therefore their authority only for the application of the word; for its meaning, or meanings, we go to the living oracles.

JUSTIN MARTYR says of converts to christianity—'they are led by us to a place where there is *water*, and in the same way of *regeneration* in which we were *regenerated*, they are *regenerated;* for they are then washed in that *water* in the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ said, If ye be not *regenerated*, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' . . . . 'there is invoked over him who is willing to be *regenerated*, and has repented of his sins, the name of God the Father and Lord of all' . . . . 'and this *washing* is called illumination.'[2]

IRENÆUS. 'When he gave his disciples the commission of *regenerating* unto God, he said unto them, Go and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.' The same father says of our Lord—'he came to save all persons by himself: all, I mean, who by him are *regenerated* unto God; infants, and little ones, and youths, and older persons.' Again: 'this generation of heretics has been sent out by Satan for frustrating the *baptism* of *regeneration* unto God.'[3]

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. 'He that is once *regenerated*, as the name of that [sacrament] is.' Again, speaking of a fancy of certain heretics concerning the baptism

1 See Suicer on Αναπλασις, Ανακαινισις, &c.: also, the Appendix (*p.* 72, *&c.*) to Dr. Jarvis' Convention Sermon, on John iii. 9: also, the Appendix to this Essay.

2 Just. Mart. Apol. i. (*vulg.* ii.) *sect.* 79, 80.

3 Iren. adv. Hæres. *l.* 3. *c.* 19: *l.* 2. *c.* 39: *l.* 1. *c.* 18: see Wall

of Christ—'let us then ask these wise men, was Christ, as soon as he was *regenerated*, perfect? .... as soon as *baptized* by John, he is perfect,' or perfectly initiated:[1] as no one can suppose that Jesus, who was without sin, underwent the change of character, the regeneration here mentioned could have had no affinity with the moral new birth: whether John's baptism was a regeneration, we do not discuss.

TERTULLIAN. 'Whereas it is an acknowledged rule (præscribitur) that none can be saved without *baptism;* grounded especially on that sentence of our Lord, unless one be *born of water* he cannot be saved,' &c. Again: speaking of the command to baptize all nations, he proceeds—'when to this law that rule is added, except one be *regenerated* of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven, it has bound up faith to a necessity of *baptism.*'[2]

ORIGEN, speaking of the resurrection, says—'For that is a regeneration, being a new birth when a new heaven and a new earth are made .... and the way to that regeneration is that which by Paul is called the *laver of regeneration* .... There is perhaps in our [natural] birth no one clean from pollution, though his life be but of one day .... but in the *regeneration* by the laver, every one that is *born again* of *water* and the Spirit is clean from pollution; clean, as I may venture to say, as through a glass darkly εν αινιγματι. And in that other regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, every one that attains to that regeneration in Christ is clean from pollution in the highest degree; face to face. And it is by the *washing* of *regeneration* that he comes to that other regeneration.'[3]

1 Clem. Alex. Pædagog. *l.* 1. *c.* 6: see Wall.
2 Tertul. de Bapt. *c.* 12, 13: see Wall. 3 Comment. in Matt.: see Wall.

CYPRIAN. 'That the old man dies and the new is *born* in *baptism*, the blessed apostle clearly proves, saying, He saved us by the laver of *regeneration*. If however *regeneration* is in the laver, that is, in *baptism*, how can heresy *beget sons* to God through Christ?'[1]

ATHANASIUS. 'He who is *baptized* puts off the old man, and is *renewed*, as being *born again* (or from above) by the grace of the Spirit.'[2]

GREGORY NAZIANZEN. 'The word teaches us that generation is threefold, that of our bodies, that of *baptism*, and that of the resurrection.' Again, speaking of the Arians—'seek for somebody else to *baptize* you, or rather drown you; for I have no mind to divide the Deity, and at the time of your *new birth* to bring death on you.'[3]

CHRYSOSTOM. 'Because *baptism* is said to be a symbol of death and resurrection, therefore it is also called a *regeneration*. For, as one rising from the dead seems to be born again, so is he who in *baptism* is *regenerated*; as he has first died in the *water*, so being raised thence by the power of the *Spirit*, he is said to be *regenerated*.' Again: 'For they are not only free, but saints; nor saints only, but justified; and not only justified, but *sons*; and not only *sons*, but heirs; not heirs only, but brothers of Christ; not only his brethren, but co-heirs; not co-heirs only, but members of him; not members only, but his temple; and not his temple only, but organs of his Spirit. You see how many are the benefits of *baptism*.'[4]

AUGUSTINE. 'The force of that *sacrament* is such, that he who is once *regenerated* by it,' &c. Again: 'Let it not disturb you, that some persons do not bring their in-

1 Waterland on Regeneration, (Weller Tracts,) *p.* 6.

2 Suicer on Ανακαινισις. 3 Orat. in Sanct. Bapt.: see Wall.

4 Suicer on Αναγεννησις: also a Homily cited by Augustine; see Wall. In Bp. Hobart's Works, *V.* 2. *p.* 462, quotations are given to the same effect from Basil and Theodoret.

fants to receive *baptism* that they may by spiritual grace be *regenerated* to eternal life, but because they think by this remedy to preserve or restore their temporal health; for they do not on that account fail to be *regenerated.*' Again: 'What christian can endure to hear it said, that any person may come to salvation who is not *regenerated* in Christ, which he has ordered to be done in *baptism.*' Again: 'Therefore the *baptism* of infants is no more than what is necessary; that they, who by their generation are subject to that condemnation, may by *regeneration* be freed from it.' Again: 'The guilt (of the law of sin) is removed in the *sacrament* by which believers are *regenerated.*' Again: 'The renovation after the image of God is not effected in a moment, like that *regeneration in baptism* which is done in a moment by the remission of sins.' Yet again: speaking of his mother, 'she had lately begun to feel thy holy love, and had been *washed* in the laver of *regeneration:*' and of Victorinus, 'he was not ashamed to become a *child* of thy Christ, an infant of thy *fountain*, with his neck subjected to the yoke of humility, and his *forehead* subdued to the reproach of the *cross* .... not long after he gave in his name, that he might have the benefit of christian *baptism*' .... 'well did it become thy *sons* to exult.'[1]

CHAPTER III.—SECTION 3.

OTHER HUMAN AUTHORITIES.

We offer the following exhibition of authorities, besides that of the Fathers, already given, to those who deny

[1] Wall (3d Edit.) *V.* 1. *p.* 89, 193, 281, and *ch.* 19. § 19. Calv. Instit. *V.* 2. *p.* 76. Bp. Inglis on Inf. Bapt. *p.* 4. Aug. Conf. abridged in Milner's Ch. Hist. *V.* 2. *p.* 301, 336, 337, 338.

that baptism is, in any sense, regeneration, or connected with a change bearing that name. Various Churches, and Divines, of various creeds, allow this connexion in some way or other. And some authors who deny that any regeneration takes place in that sacrament, use such language as appears, at least, to be inconsistent with their opinion. These considerations are not, indeed, in themselves imperative; yet they afford a strong argument in regard to the due interpretation of Scripture on this subject. Our authorities now to be adduced are later than the PRIMITIVE CHURCH, the testimony of which has been seen in that of the FATHERS.

The CHURCH of ROME. 'Baptism, by way of a *new birth;* by which we are made *children* of God, and are washed from sin.'—'And let them hence understand the happy effects of Baptism: in virtue whereof, 1. The gates of heaven, shut against sinners, are open to them. 2. The Holy Ghost descends upon them, making them in innocence like doves. 3. They are made the *adopted children* of God, and heirs apparent to the kingdom of heaven.'[1]

The GREEK CHURCH. The following is quoted by Bishop White from Smith's Account of it—'the baptized persons being *regenerated* and made members of the body of Christ.' In Pinkerton's Account of the Greek Church in Russia, the new birth is represented as an effect of baptism, yet contingent on the faith of the receiver.[2]

We hasten on to the various PROTESTANT CHURCHES, as these only are held to be authority by those to whom this portion of our argument is addressed. And here we first introduce a passage from Archbishop Tillotson. 'I cannot imagine why so great a scruple should be made of those expressions which our church useth in the office of

1 True Piety: approved by Bp. Kenrick. (*Cummiskey*, 1832.) *p.* 23.—Layman's Ritual. (*New-York, Doyle*, 1834.) *p.* 9.

2 Bp. White's Compar. *V.* 2. *p.* 324. Pinkerton, *p.* 142.

baptism . . . . being *regenerated and born again by baptism, and being thereby made the children of God, and heirs of eternal life.* . . . . I cannot see that our church, in her highest expressions concerning the benefits and effects of baptism, says any thing but what is very agreeable to both the expressions and sense of scripture. And thus not only the ancient Fathers spake of this matter, but so likewise *all the Liturgies of all the Reformed Churches*, in the offices and forms appointed by them for the administration of baptism; so that it seems a very affected singularity, to take exception at such expressions as have constantly been, and still are generally used in *all christian churches.*[1]

The PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, in England and America, declares, after the baptism of every infant and of every adult, that each of them is '*regenerate* and grafted into the body of Christ's church;' and the Thanksgiving after baptism, in the respective cases, speaks to the same effect. It is not said there that the church generally, or any number of persons generally, are regenerate, but that each baptized *individual* is regenerated at the font.[2]

The LUTHERAN CHURCH. 'This innate disease and original sin is in reality subjecting all those to the eternal wrath of God, who are not *regenerated* by *baptism* and the Holy Spirit.'—'For without the word of God, the water is mere water, and no baptism; but with the word of God, it is a *baptism*, that is, a merciful water of life, and a laver of

1 Tillot. Serm. *fol. V.* 3. *p.* 290.

2 In the English form of receiving into the congregation infants that have been privately baptized, it is declared, 'that this child is *by baptism* regenerate'—and, in a previous part of the office, 'is now *by the laver of regeneration in baptism*, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life.' These passages are not in our Prayer-book: and the omission is judicious—1. because, while the connection of baptism with [a] regeneration is sufficiently declared elsewhere, there is avoided too close and rigorous a definition, which furthers contrariety, rather than union in doctrine—and 2. because it is not quite correct to say that a certain predicate 'is *now*,' or may 'now' be made, which was true at a previous time.

regeneration in the Holy Ghost: as Paul says to Titus, iii. 5, 6.'[1]

The PURITANS did not entirely renounce this doctrine. Mr. Baxter says—'We are sacramentally buried and risen with Christ, as dead to sin, and made *new creatures*, when we are *baptized;* therefore it is called the laver of *regeneration.*' The editors of the latter part of Poole's Annotations, in asserting the identity of John's baptism with that of Christ, remark—'And *baptism* being an ordinance for our *regeneration* and *new birth*, as we can be born but once in the flesh, we can be but once also *born in the Spirit;* and no more may christians be *baptized* twice, than the Jews could be twice circumcised:'[2] this argument, it will be seen, is built on the principle, that to be 'baptized' and to be 'born in the Spirit' are the same—besides that it is declared explicitly that baptism is for our new birth.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. The Confession of Faith calls the visible church the '*family* of God:' that is, her members are children of God, and of course born (again) of God, or regenerate. It declares that 'there is in every sacrament a . . . . sacramental *union* between the sign and the thing signified'—and that 'baptism is a *sign* and seal . . . . of regeneration:' of course there is a sacramental 'union' between baptism, the sign, and regeneration, the thing signified. It further declares that, although 'grace' is not so tied to baptism as that none can be 'regenerated' without it, or so as that all are 'regenerated' who receive it, or at the time of receiving it, 'yet notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the *grace* promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and *conferred* by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's

[1] Aug. Conf. *Art.* 2. Dr. Martin Luther's Catechism. (*Phila.* 1828.)
[2] Baxter's Pract. Works, *fol. V.* 4. *p.* 138. Poole's Annot. on Acts xix. 5.

own will, in his appointed time:' this language is express: and it means that, besides other benefits, regeneration is conferred by baptism, either at the time, or in due season afterwards, on all the elect who are baptized. The Notes to the Confession, having the authority of the General Assembly, refer to baptism the texts, 'born of water, and of the Spirit,' 'the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.'[1]

The Church of Geneva, in the Catechism written by Calvin, teaches the catechumen to say, of the water of baptism, 'I consider it to be a figure, but at the same time it has the substance *connected* with it; for God in promising us his gifts does not deceive us; therefore as forgiveness of sins and *newness of life* are offered to us in *baptism*, so it is certain they are *received* by us.' The same document speaks of 'regeneration,' the crucifixion of our old man, the burial of our corrupt nature, our being begotten unto a new life, as 'benefits *conferred* on us by baptism.'[2]

In Scotch editions of the Bible, besides the metre Psalms, there are metrical Paraphrases of scripture, which are used, we infer, in the Church of Scotland. One of these, a version of part of Rom. vi., contains the following lines—

> When to the sacred fount we came,
> Did not the rite proclaim,
> That, washed from sin, and all its stains,
> New creatures we became?

The Church of Holland, in the Heidelberg Catechism, says, 'the Holy Ghost calls *baptism* the washing of *regeneration*.' In the Confession of the Synod of Dort, she declares that the sacraments 'are visible signs and seals of an inward and invisible thing, by *means* whereof God

[1] Conf. Faith, *ch.* xxv. 2. xxvii. 2. xxviii. 1, 5, 6: see also the 'Minute' at the end of the book.

[2] Catech. of the Chh. of Gen. *Transl. by Waterman, p.* 93, 94.

worketh in us by the power of the Holy Ghost'—that baptism 'serves as a testimony unto us, that He will for ever be our gracious God and *Father*'—and that we ought not to be twice baptized, 'since we cannot be *born* twice:' which argument, as in Poole's Annotations already quoted, is, in effect, that there is only one baptism, *because* there is only one regeneration, and the two are most intimately connected together. And, in the Form of administering baptism, she asserts, 'when we are baptized in the name of the Father, God the Father witnesseth and sealeth unto us, that he . . . . *adopts* us for his *children* and *heirs*,' &c.[1]

The German Reformed Churches use the Heidelberg Catechism,[2] in which, as we have just seen, it is declared, 'the Holy Ghost calls *baptism* the washing of *regeneration*.'

Presbyterian Divines. Macknight refers both '*born* of water' and the 'washing of *regeneration*' to baptism: and he says of the Israelites, 'the honourable appellation of *the children of God* was given them, because they were God's *visible church* and people.'—Doddridge refers '*born* of water' to baptism.—Watts, in his Catechism for children, refers 'the washing of *regeneration*' to baptism. Saurin, in his Sermons, does the same.—Beza says, 'we are peculiarly said to be incorporated with the Lord in his supper, but to be *regenerated* by his Spirit in *baptism*.'[3]

Calvin. We give the language of this eminent divine as we find it; some of it appears to be inconsistent with his theory concerning regeneration and baptism. He writes thus—'Christ hath purified us in the laver of his blood, and hath *communicated* this purification by *baptism*'

1 Heid. Catech. *Quest.* 73. Conf. Dort, *Art.* 33, 34.

2 Prot. Epis. for March, 1835, *p.* 103.

3 Macknight on Rom. ix. 8. Watts Catech. for Child. *Quest.* 55. Saurin's Serm. *V.* 8. *p.* 245. Beza on 1 Cor. xii. 13.

—'Baptism is a sign of initiation, by which we are admitted into the society of the church, in order that being incorporated into Christ we may be numbered among the *children* of God'—'by whom they (infants) were *accepted* as his *children* by the solemn symbol of *adoption*, before they were capable of knowing him as their *Father*'—'we are the *children* of God, because we have put on Christ in *baptism*'—'of this *regeneration* we have an earnest in *baptism*.'[1] These passages, though they may be explained in accordance with Calvin's theory, seem to recognise a regeneration at the font. Some other passages are so much more decidedly to this effect, that we know not how to reconcile them with the opinions of the author. He says—'We conclude, therefore, that we are baptized into the mortification of the flesh, which *commences* in us *at baptism*, which we pursue from day to day, and which will be perfected when we shall pass out of this life unto the Lord:' the 'mortification of the flesh' here named, is that practical subduing of our depravity which we are to 'pursue' through life, and which is to be made 'perfect' in the life to come; this *moral* change, says Calvin, 'commences in us at baptism;' nothing is left figurative or contingent. And regeneration, he elsewhere remarks, takes place at the same time—'they who receive *baptism* with the faith with which they ought to receive it, truly experience the efficacy of Christ's death in the mortification of the flesh, and also the energy of his resurrection in the *vivification* [new life] of the Spirit.'[2] These, argues Calvin in effect, if we have 'faith'—both these, the practical victory over sin, and the new life or new birth, 'commence in us at baptism.' Doubtless he meant this language to be taken in conformity with his theory of the matter; and so, in justice, we must

1 Calv. Instit. *V.* 2. *p.* 162. *V.* 3. *p.* 326, 355, 330.
2 Calv. Instit. *V.* 3. *p.* 335, 330.

understand him. Yet who can deny that his argument outruns his doctrine, and brings an involuntary, though an extravagant tribute, to the high character of the sacrament of the font?

Calvin has also the following passage—'But as our present design is to treat of the *visible church*, we may learn even from the title of *mother*, how useful and even necessary it is for us to know her; since there is no other way of entrance into *life*, unless we are *conceived* by her, *born* of her, nourished at her breast, and continually preserved under her care and government till we are divested of this mortal flesh and become like the angels.' He adds, in the same section—'the *paternal* favour of God, and the peculiar testimony of the spiritual life, are restricted to his *flock*, to teach us that it is always fatally dangerous to be separated from the *Church*.'[1]

Congregational Churches. The Saybrook Platform declares, that by the right use of this ordinance the *grace* promised is really *conferred* by the Holy Ghost'—that baptism is a 'sign of *regeneration*;' which shows what 'grace' is 'conferred' in that rite—and that it is the means of introducing us into the 'family' of God, i. e. to the circle of his *children*.[2]

The Methodist Church, after a baptism is performed, returns thanks to God for 'receiving the infant for his own *child* by *adoption*:'—the child of God is of course born (again) of God, or regenerate.

Dr. A. Clarke says, on one of the texts pertaining to this discussion—'by the washing of *regeneration*: Undoubtedly the apostle here means *baptism*, the rite by which persons were admitted into the church . . . . baptism is only a sign, and therefore should never be separated from the thing signified; but it is a rite commanded by God himself, and

1 Calv. Instit. *V.* 3. *p.* 9, 10. 2 Sayb. Plat. *ch.* 29.

therefore the thing signified should never be expected without it.'

We have not adduced these Authorities to support the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as maintained in this essay: some of them differ from us very widely: and we rest the claims of our doctrine on scripture only, leaving the decision to those who will impartially examine what we have adduced in its favour from that holy volume. Yet we cannot but think, that the quotations offered in this section, present a powerful argument for so interpreting scripture, as *in some way* to connect [a] regeneration with the initiating sacrament of the christian church.

CHAPTER III.—SECTION 4.

FURTHER REMARKS ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

As there is but one means of baptismal regeneration, water applied in the name of the Trinity, this operation of the Spirit cannot, we presume, be increased. Neither do we suppose it to be diminished or lost, while the person who has received it is in the church, or is not finally separated from it. It will, however, be cancelled in those whose 'part God shall take away out of the book of life, and out of the holy city,' the church.[1]

This regeneration, to membership in the visible church, is not, at least to human penetration, a moral endowment of the Holy Ghost. Hence it is said, 'all the house of Israel [circumcised in the flesh] are uncircumcised in the heart.' The Jews also rebuked by our Saviour, though children of God in the ecclesiastical sense, as we have seen, were in the moral account, 'of their father the devil.'

[1] Rev. xxii. 19. iii. 5. Ps. lxix. 28.

So likewise the christian body consists of both 'tares and wheat;' and though the tares are baptized into that body by the washing of regeneration, and are in that sense, as are 'all' the baptized, children of God, yet being morally unregenerate, they are in that other sense 'children of the wicked one.' In that body, 'all' the members of which are baptismally the children of God, there was and is the distinction, founded on the higher meaning of the phrase—the distinction of righteous and unrighteous, by which 'the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil.' Satan is said to be 'transformed into an angel of light, and his ministers into ministers of righteousness:' and, in close analogy, his children receive by baptism the name and rank of children of God—the Spirit ratifying the baptism of the latter, as he does the ordination of the former.[1] This mixture in the earthly church is constantly declared in scripture. But mere church privileges are no substitute for moral and pious attainments: in heaven there will be *no* mixture.

Baptism, taking the place of circumcision, is the seal of the great covenant, by which God, for Christ's sake, engages to confer on us all the benefits purchased for us by Christ, more especially pardon and full grace here, and glory hereafter: our *title* to pardon, grace and glory, is thus sealed, or made complete on God's part, so that it will hold good if the conditions on our part are fulfilled. As a covenant implies obligations on both the parties, no man has other than a conditional title to these blessings. The condition is, that we so improve the grace of the Spirit as it is given, as to exercise 'repentance towards God and

[1] Jer. ix. 26. Matt. xiii. 24, 25, 38; (the expression, 'the field is the world,' means, 'is the church in the world;' see Macknight:—'the visible church, scattered all the world over;' see M. Henry.) John viii. 34. 1 John iii. 10. 2 Cor. xi. 14, 15.

faith in our Lord Jesus Christ,' and 'walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called.'

Baptism, again, as the means of our baptismal regeneration, confers on us the *title* mentioned—the grant, both of the title and of possession under it, being only for the sake, and through the merits of the Saviour. Our investiture with the appellation, *sons* of God, makes us '*heirs* of God through Christ.' An heir, in the proper sense of the word, though its meaning is not always thus restricted, is not in present possession of his inheritance, but only has a right to expect it, and that perhaps conditionally: it is in this sense that baptism, in making us children of God, makes us heirs of heaven. Heirship, however, may devolve present advantages on the heir, or place them within his immediate reach, some smaller estate and lower dignity; and hence we are said to have '*obtained* an inheritance in Christ,' the blessings of the christian dispensation, the light of the gospel, the ordinances, renewing grace, moral regeneration, access to the Father, peace and hope through the Spirit; while yet all this is only 'the *earnest* of our inheritance,' the greater inheritance to come with 'the redemption of the purchased possession.'[1] Having this title,

[1] Gal. iv. 7. Eph. i. 11, 14: see also Gal. iii. 29. Eph. iii. 6. Theodoret has the expression, 'the baptism of *immortality* and regeneration:' *Serm.* 7; see Suicer. Augustine, as we have seen, says that by baptism infants are 'regenerated to *eternal life*.' And Origen makes baptismal regeneration the 'way' to the regeneration in glory.—It may be asked, whether moral regeneration, making a person the child of God, does not, without baptism, make him an heir, and give him the covenant seal and title? We answer—that though it makes the baptized heirs, in virtue of that other relation to God, the moral new birth; as St. Paul says of such, 'if children, then heirs;' (Rom. viii. 17.) yet there is no scripture for calling heirs the *un*baptized, who are thus 'the children of God' (John xi. 52.)—and further, we reply that moral regeneration does not give to any one the covenant seal and title. A title must be verifiable and certain; but moral regeneration is a matter of hope, of confidence, not of positive certainty. A seal or token must be a thing visible, which moral regeneration is not. Outward circumcision, not the inward, was the old covenant seal; and so baptism, taking its place, is

being thus heirs, in virtue of our baptism, and through the merits of Christ, it rests with us, by the help of the Spirit, to make sure the eternal possession: for actual ultimate possession is not always guarantied with the grant of a right or title. The pope, and several European kings, bestowed on certain persons a title to portions of America; but it rested with these persons to subdue or remove the natives, and so make their title effectual: and baptism seals our right to an inheritance in the heavenly country, yet to make that right availing, we must, through Christ and his Spirit, overcome the enemies and obstacles that interpose between the grant and the possession. The Israelites who left Egypt had a divine title to the land of Canaan; but becoming afraid of their enemies, 'they could not enter in because of unbelief:' and christians are warned, 'lest, a *promise* being left them of entering into God's rest, any of them should seem to come short of it.'[1]

To the church is granted the covenant of salvation; which covenant is made with her individual members in baptism, as it is renewed and perpetuated in the eucharist. The hopes of the heathen, of Mahomedan and like infidels, and of all who are not baptized into the visible body of Christ, are vague and general; for they do but *argue*, or we in their behalf, that God may be merciful to them: but the hopes of the members of that body are built on the covenant, on the express *stipulation* of God, made with each of them, that he will, for Christ's sake, bring them to heaven, if they are truly penitent believers. Hence it is

the title, not the change of heart. It must be remarked also, that the moral regeneration of the baptized, is so much fulfilled of the conditions under which the title is held, and shows the heirship to be so far availing, the possession so far acquired, and the final inheritance so much more sure: this may be all the apostle meant in the consoling language just quoted.

[1] Exod. vi. 8. Numb. xiii. xiv. Heb. iii. 19. iv. 1. The chosen line of Abraham *always* had the title to Canaan, (Gen. xvii. 8.) but never gained possession of it till under Joshua.

declared, that it is 'the *church* of God which is purchased with his own blood:' for, although the death of Jesus was a 'propitiation for the sins of the whole world,' and though many will be saved, we trust, by that propitiation who are ignorant of it, yet there is no engagement on the part of Heaven with *individual persons* out of the church, that they shall be finally ransomed by it: whereas, *in* the church, a specific covenant is made with each of its members individually, that they shall remain in God's favour through Christ everlastingly, if they walk worthy of their vocation, if they rely on the Saviour, and love him, and keep his commandments. Nothing definite is declared concerning the benefits Christ may have purchased for those good persons who are not in his visible fold: but the ransom of the good *within* that fold is clear and certain.

On the subject of the benefits of baptism, our baptismal offices recognize, in that rite, the 'promise' of God to bestow remission of sins or pardon, the Holy Ghost or moral regeneration, and everlasting life. And our Article xxvii. declares that 'baptism is a sign of regeneration or new birth,' by which sign 'the *promises* of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed:' the *two* filial relations to God are here set forth, the one existing in virtue of baptism, the other 'promised;' and baptism, in conferring the former, seals the promise of the latter, as also of the forgiveness of sin, and of the everlasting bliss in order to which they are granted.[1] Such is the *title* conferred or sealed in this sacrament.

The doctrine of the baptismal title is fully recognized by Calvin—'it resembles a legal instrument, properly attested, by which the Lord assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated'—'at whatever time we

[1] See further, *Chap.* v. *Sect.* 1. of this Essay.

are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life: whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of *it*, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins'—'the faithful, whenever in any part of their lives they are distressed with a consciousness of their sins, may justly have recourse to the remembrance of baptism, in order to confirm themselves in the confidence of their interest in that one perpetual ablution which is enjoyed in the blood of Christ.'[1] A passage in Dr. Paley's Clergyman's Companion, gives a just view of remission or pardon, as granted under the baptismal title—'although forgiveness of sins is consigned to us in baptism, and baptism is but once; yet, forgiveness of sins being the special grace of the gospel, it is secured to us for our life, and ebbs and flows according as we discompose or renew the performance of our baptismal vow.'[2] Bishop Taylor declares to the same effect—'he that is baptized has for ever a title to the promises, and a possibility of repentance, and a right to restitution, until he renounces all, and never will or can repent.'[3] Equally sound is the language of Bishop Seabury—'The kingdom of God is the church of God, the same church both in this world and the next, for God has but one church, the body of Christ. By baptism we are made members of this church; and if we continue faithful members till death, shall in it obtain a happy resurrection, and everlasting life—shall continue members of it to all eternity.'[4]

It is a reflection full of comfort to the christian, that he always bears about him, in virtue of his baptism, a title to, and, fulfilling his part of the covenant, will actually obtain,

1 Calv. Inst. Allen's transl. *v.* 3. *p.* 327, 328, 329.
2 Paley's Works, *v.* 5. *p.* 329.
3 Taylor's Serm. *v.* 3. *p.* 323.
4 Seabury's Disc. *v.* 1. *p.* 105.

all that God has promised on *his* part—pardon, all needful grace, and the eternal weight of glory.[1]

1 It has been objected, that we make baptism an 'outward spiritual grace,' instead of an 'inward' one, which the Catechism declares it to be. Not so. We deny that any deposite is given in baptism, such as may be figuratively called a seed, germ, or leaven, of moral grace, as essentially connected with the rite. But, is this the only sense of the phrase 'inward grace?' if it be, then some of the most accepted writers on the subject, with the many who have adopted their opinions, will be under the imputation of contradicting the Catechism. Is not however the covenant title to moral grace, itself a grace—is not the title to forgiveness of sins, and to heaven, a grace—and is it not conferred on the soul—and is not this gift to the soul 'an inward grace,' truly and properly—an inward spiritual grace, 'given unto us' by the 'one Spirit who baptizes us all into the one body?' What would make the supposed deposite of baptism 'an inward grace,' but its connexion with the soul? We regard therefore the objection as gratuitous.—The attempt however has been made to strengthen it, by alleging that this kind of grace in baptism does but resemble the *outward* spiritual grace of ordination. But who does not perceive, that the operation of the Spirit in 'making men overseers' of the flock is inward? The soul, the entire person, of a minister is ordained or set apart by the Holy Ghost, through human agents; as the soul, the entire person, is ecclesiastically regenerated, or set apart by the Spirit, from the world to the church, in baptism, though the outward washing is performed by the agency of the minister. Hence, in both rites, the grace is inward as well as spiritual. Yet, as both baptism and ordination are valid and complete in even wicked persons, the essential inward grace of neither is of the moral kind.

CHAPTER IV.

MORAL REGENERATION.

SECTION I.

SCRIPTURAL PROOFS.

We proceed to the consideration of the change of character mentioned. We are to prove, from scripture, that it is recovery from the dominion of sin to victory over it, and, in the baptized, from the curse of sin to pardon; that it is ordinarily effected in the use of means of grace, yet by the power of the Holy Ghost; that it is called conversion, renewing or new creating, or (moral) regeneration; and that it is gradual and progressive.

This change of character is recovery from the dominion of sin to victory over it—'the new man which is created in *righteousness* and true *holiness*'—'whatsoever is born of God *overcometh* the world'—'he that is begotten of God *keepeth* himself,' like a soldier in self-defence, 'and that wicked one *toucheth* him *not*.'[1]

This change of character is, in members of the church visible, recovery from the curse of sin to pardon—'repent and be converted, that your *sins* may be *blotted out*'—'there is *no condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit'—'against such there is *no law*.' As this and all similar language is

[1] Eph. iv. 24. 1 John v. 4, 18.

spoken of persons baptized, or about to be so, the reception of that sacrament must always be included among the conditions of pardon on scriptural principles, besides that it is also its seal. We add, to the same effect—'he that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved'—'repent and be *baptized*, every one of you, for the remission of sins'—'be *baptized*, and wash away thy sins'—'let us draw near .... in *full assurance* of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our *bodies* washed with pure *water*.'[1] Of the same purport are the passages—'except a man be born of *water*, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God'—'he saved us, by the *washing* of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.'

This change takes place in the use or enjoyment of the means of grace: union with the visible church—'ye are builded together [into the church] for an *habitation* of God through the *Spirit*:' adverse providences—'before I was *afflicted* I went wrong, but now have I kept thy word:' prosperity—'doth Job fear God for *nought?*' pious education—'bring them up in the *nurture* and admonition of the Lord:' the word of God—'all *scripture* is profitable .... that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works:' preaching—'the *preaching* of the gospel .... is the power of God:' religious books are appendages to either education or preaching: godly conversation—'that [communication out of your *mouth*] which is good, to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers:' prayer—'your heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that *ask* him:' solemn benedictions—'without all contradiction, the less is *blessed* of the better:' baptism, as devoutly received by adults, and as devoutly reflected on by all—'we are buried with him

1 Acts iii. 19. Rom. viii. 1. Gal. v. 23. Mar. xvi. 16. Acts ii. 38. xxii. 16. Heb. x. 22.

by *baptism* . . . . that we should walk in newness of life :' the holy supper—' he that eateth my *flesh*, and drinketh my *blood*, dwelleth in me, and I in him.'[1]

This change is effected by the Holy Spirit—' it is *God* which [by his Spirit] worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure'—' walk in the *Spirit*, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh'—' if ye through the *Spirit* do mortify the deeds of the body'—' and I will put my *Spirit* within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.'[2]

The change of character we speak of is called conversion or turning, the two words being synonymous—' *turn* thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be *turned*'—' *turn* ye even to me with all your heart'—' except ye be *converted* and become as little children.'[3] It is also called renewing or new creating, these words likewise being synonymous—' *create* in me a clean heart, O God, and *renew* a right spirit within me'—' be ye transformed by the *renewing* of your mind'—' *make* you a *new* heart and a *new* spirit'—' be *renewed* in the spirit of your mind'—' put on the *new* man, which after God is *created* in righteousness and true holiness.'[4] It is further spoken of as a [moral] regeneration : and here many texts already cited, (*ch.* 2. *sect.* 1) are applicable—those who fear the Lord, the peace-makers, those who love their enemies, and do good, the contented, blameless and harmless, the obedient who abandon their former lusts, are denominated *children* of God—those who do righteousness, have divine love, and believe that Jesus is the Christ, who do not commit sin, but overcome the

[1] Eph. ii. 22. Ps. cxix. 67. Job i. 9. Eph. vi. 3. 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. 1 Cor. i. 18. Eph. iv. 29. Luke xi. 13. Heb. vii. 7. Rom. vi. 4. John vi. 56.

[2] Phil. ii. 13. Gal. v. 16. Rom. viii. 13. Ezek. xxxvi. 27.

[3] Lam. v. 21. Joel ii. 12. Matt. xviii. 3.

[4] Ps. li. 10. Rom. xii. 2. Ezek. xviii. 31. Eph. iv. 23, 24.

world, and keep themselves that the wicked one touch them not, are declared to be *born* or *begotten* of God—those who through the Spirit have purified their souls in obeying the truth, and who lay aside all malice, guile, and evil dispositions and conversations, are recognised as *born again* of incorruptible seed, as *new born*. All such designations are, as we have shown, equivalent to *regenerated*. To these proofs we add the following—'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the *sons* of God' —'the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the *children* of God;'[1] which latter passage refers to the persuasion, which, when soundly examined, and found concurring with the humble yet candid testimony of our good conscience, we are allowed to regard as the testimony of the Holy Ghost, that we are morally regenerate.

Without noticing some other passages, the application of which, whether to baptism, or to the change of heart, or perhaps to both, need not here be investigated, we will only add a brief exposition of the conversation of our Lord with Nicodemus. That ruler has so much of a right mind, as to acknowledge Jesus to be 'a teacher come from God.' Our Saviour admonishes him that his mind and affections must undergo a more thorough change, before he can 'see,' that is, enjoy, or gain possession of, 'the kingdom of God' in heaven; and calls this change being 'born again,' or 'born (again) from above.' The ruler comprehends this figurative expression as meaning a very great change in the heart and character; but, though a master in Israel, and though his own scriptures might have taught him better, he does not agree to the doctrine it implied; and he therefore objects, that so entire a new creation of man's nature and habits is as improbable as his actual and na-

1 Rom. viii. 14, 16.

tural new birth. Our Lord then replies more fully, that he must not only be thus morally born again, but also, by the new birth of baptism, assume the christian covenant, and enter the christian church, which was henceforth to be the especial channel of the grace producing and furthering moral regeneration—he must be born again of water, as well as born again of the converting influence of the Spirit, in order to an entrance into the kingdom of God in heaven. Then, our Lord returns to the subject of the moral new birth.[1] This is the key we prefer for this highly important conversation. The necessity of the change of character was the first, and is throughout the principal topic. But the necessity of baptism also is declared—baptism, as well as moral regeneration, is required for our admission into the celestial kingdom—is ordinarily necessary—incapacity, ignorance, involuntary error, and want of opportunity, being perhaps the only known exceptions to the rule so plainly enjoined by our Lord himself.

Lastly: This change, moral regeneration, is gradual and progressive; it admits of increase, decay, renewal, repetition; it is not only the commencing point of sanctification, but includes also its several stages, to the highest; and each stage is fresh regeneration. This part of our subject we deem of peculiar importance, as it has been

1 John iii. Various interpretations are given of this conversation, each perhaps consistent with itself, yet contradicting the rest. We prefer the one given above, because of its entire congruity with the numerous scriptures adduced and arranged in this essay, and particularly because it agrees accurately with the declaration, 'he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.'—It has been objected, that our Lord mentions only *one* regeneration to Nicodemus: but this remark, as applied to verse 5, is only assumption; he there speaks of two regenerations, as plainly as he does elsewhere of one. Besides, the whole force of the scriptural investigations we have now made, declare in favour of our Lord's recognising, in that place, the *two* new births.

too generally overlooked or misapprehended. To establish our proposition, we again appeal to the holy volume.

We have seen that St. Paul declared to the Corinthians generally, whom he styles his 'beloved *sons*,' that 'in Christ Jesus he had *begotten* them through the gospel;' and that this must refer to their moral regeneration, as he had baptized but a very few of the members of their church. Morally regenerate therefore they were, generally. Yet in the epistle written afterwards, as we have also seen, though he still says, 'I speak as unto my *children*,' he exhorts them, in the name of God, to be separate from unbelievers and idolaters, 'and I will be a *Father* unto you, and ye shall be my *sons* and *daughters*, saith the Lord Almighty.'[1] In other words, he assures them that this improvement of their religious principles and conduct would indicate that they were *newly* regenerated, in the moral sense.

Another passage to our purpose is—'my *little children*, of whom I travail in birth *again* παλιν, until Christ be formed in you.'[2] St. Paul terms the Galatians 'little children,' because their moral regeneration was, as we have hinted, at a very low ebb. He had thus 'travailed' for them once, and he now does it again; himself being the instrument, and the Holy Spirit the efficient agent, in both cases; and his travailing being for their new birth each time. And, *each time*, the moral regeneration of these converts was the object desired, that new birth which gradually 'forms Christ in us.' This regeneration therefore may be repeated, and indeed must be as often as we have occasion for it.

1 1 Cor. iv. 14, 15. 2 Cor. vi. 13, 18.

2 Gal. iv. 19. Poole's Synopsis, on this verse, has the following passage, 'Fœtus physicus non nisi semel gestari et edi potest; fœtus moralis sæpius:' and, concerning the forming of Christ in us, the following, 'Fœtus paulatim in utero formam suam accipit.'

A further, and perhaps stronger confirmation of this part of our subject, will be found in another class of scriptures. New birth and new creation (or renewing) are obviously convertible terms, since our natural birth or begetting is our only natural creation: this proposition is, we repeat, obvious.[1] Hence, the expression 'the inward man is *renewed* [new created ανακαινουται] day by day,' is equivalent to 'the inward man is *regenerated* day by day:' its moral regeneration is daily increased, and repeated if it has decayed. Again: David was unquestionably morally regenerate in youth; yet, after his grievous fall, he beseeches God to '*create* in him a clean heart,' in other words, to restore him by new regeneration. Again: We have the passage, 'the new man, which is *renewed* [new created] in knowledge after the image of him that *created* him:' i. e. the new man is 'created,' and afterwards is 'renewed' or new created; in other words, the new man is formed by moral regeneration, and then is formed *again* by further moral regeneration. Yet again: To frequent or habitual new creation, or moral regeneration, refers also the passage, 'that ye put on the *new* man, which after God is *created* in righteousness and true holiness:' the apostle had before said of these persons, the Ephesian church, generally, 'we *are* his workmanship, *created* in Christ Jesus unto good works;' yet he exhorts them, *again*, nay again and again, to put on the new created man, that is, to be created anew again and habitually; and this is synonymous with being regenerated anew and habitually in the moral sense.[2]

Moral regeneration is thus not a single act or operation of the Holy Spirit, producing only the first movement in the change to godliness; but an act or operation that may

1 That renovation or new creation, and regeneration, are synonymous terms, will be further shown in the APPENDIX to this essay.

2 2 Cor. iv. 14. Ps. li. 10 · (see also Calv. Instit. *V.* 3. *p.* 35.) Col. iii. 10. Eph. iv. 24: comp. ii. 10.

be repeated, and for the repetition or increase of which we are to pray, and do pray, as will be seen in a future chapter, in several parts of our Liturgy: even the best of christians require this advancement in grace. The moral new birth, also, being imperfect in this life, is subject to diminution and even extinction, and therefore requires increase, improvement, iteration. Not till death are we freed from sin; not till death does the regenerating cure of sin have its complete effect, perhaps not until the resurrection. And it is only, we think, to those who shall be thus perfectly and unchangeably regenerated, that the declaration applies in all its force, 'they *cannot* sin, because they are born of God:' to the pious yet in this life the declaration applies only in a qualified sense, as did that of Joshua to the Israelites, 'ye *cannot* serve the Lord.' It is strictly true, that the perfectly regenerate 'cannot sin.' And, according to the degree to which we have advanced in moral regeneration, is it *proportionally* true, that we 'cannot sin'—the riper we are in this new birth, the greater is the improbability of our falling.[1]

1 1 John iii. 9. Josh. xxiv. 9.—The only passage of scripture which may seem to favour the opinion that moral regeneration is a single act, not to be increased or repeated, is—'though ye have ten thousand instructers in Christ, yet have ye *not many fathers;* for in Christ Jesus *I* have begotten you through the gospel.' (1 Cor. iv. 15.) It may be alleged, that Paul here denies the *paternal* relation to a christian of all pastors but the one who was the means of producing his first effectual movement in godliness. But we have seen that he speaks of the improvement of the morally regenerate as fresh moral regeneration: and this may as well come through the ministry of other pastors, as through that of the first successful one. We conclude, therefore, that the apostle here claims to be their only spiritual father merely by way of eminence; as when our Lord said, 'call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your Father, which is in heaven.' (Matt. xxiii. 9.) God is especially our Father, yet men also are our fathers, both naturally and spiritually: and Paul was especially the spiritual father of the Corinthian brethren, yet other 'instructers' might also be their spiritual fathers. This seeming objection to our doctrine amounts then to nothing. And we know of none other in scripture—which, on the contrary, declares *for* it very largely.

CHAPTER IV.—SECTION 2.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE FATHERS.

We quoted the Fathers to show that the doctrine of a baptismal regeneration is primitive; a similar appeal will prove that applying the word regeneration, and its synonymes renewing and new creation, to the moral change we have described, is primitive also. Though the latter use of the word is far from being so common in the fathers as the former, there are some examples.—It will perhaps be alleged, that several of our extracts indicate rather a casual, than a common mode of speaking; but even in that case, they attest the truth of the doctrine of this essay, though it does not appear to have been then developed in a full and orderly manner. Others of the citations show a deliberate use of these terms in their distinctively moral sense.

Clement of Rome. 'Noah being proved to be faithful, did by his ministry preach *regeneration* παλιγγενεσιαν to the world.' The word regeneration, obviously, does not here mean baptism. It is interpreted by some of the renovation of the world after the flood: but, though the coming destruction of the world would naturally have been a topic in warning sinners, there appears to be little appropriateness in preaching of its renovation. We rather deem the expression equivalent to that of St. Peter, 'Noe, a preacher of *righteousness*' or moral regeneration. It is equivalent also to those of Clement himself in previous sections—'Noah preached *repentance*'—'all the *ministers* of the grace of God have spoken by the Holy Spirit of *repentance*'—'desiring that all his beloved should come to *repentance*:' these passages afford us the author's own interpretation of

his assertion, 'Noah did by his *ministry* preach *regeneration* to the world.'[1]

BARNABAS. 'He has put us into another frame, that we should have souls like those of children, *forming us again* [or regenerating us αναπλασσομενους] himself by the Spirit.' Again: 'ye see how we are again *formed anew* [or regenerated αναπεπλασμεθα] . . . I will take from them, that is, from those whom the Spirit of the Lord foresaw, their hearts of stone, and I will put into them hearts of flesh.' The change referred to is obviously a moral one—souls like those of children—hearts changed from stone to flesh: and it is called being formed or created anew, which is synonymous with being regenerated.[2]

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA—says of a sinful woman, 'when she has repented, or is *born again* αναγεννηθεισα by a change of her life, she has the *regeneration* παλιγγενεσιαν of life; the former unchaste woman being dead, she has come again to life, being *born* (again) γεννηθεισης by repentance.'[3]

EUSEBIUS—speaking of a youth converted by St. John, and baptized εφωτισε, who afterwards 'renounced the salvation of God,' and became a robber, but was again reclaimed by the apostle—says of him at this latter period, he 'exhibited a great example of true repentance, a great trial of *new birth* παλιγγενεσιας, and a singular token of the visible resurrection.'[4] This passage, being quoted by Eusebius

1 Clem. Rom. Epist. *sect.* 9; also *sect.* 7, 8: comp. 2 Pet. ii. 5.

2 Barn. Cath. Epist. *sect.* 6: consult Suicer on Αναπλασις; some of his remarks are quoted in our Appendix: comp. also Matt. xviii. 3.

3 If, in this passage, 'she has the regeneration of life' were allowed to mean 'she has been baptized,' still her repentance would be twice called a new birth. But Suicer, on Παλιγγενεσια, places the passage under head I. referring to regeneration simply; and puts regeneration as connected with baptism under head II. distinct from the former. Dr. Jarvis (p. 73 of his Sermon and Appendix) says, 'Clemens Alexandrinus evidently uses the term regeneration in the sense which is *now* affixed to renovation.'

4 Euseb. Eccles. Hist. *lib.* 3. *c.* 23. Mr. Crusé translates the passage thus —'Affording a powerful example of true repentance, and a great evidence of a *regeneration*, a trophy of a visible resurrection.' *p.* 107.

from Clement of Alexandria, gives us the authority of both these fathers for the moral sense of the word regeneration, for its being synonymous with 'repentance,' and for its taking place long after baptism, and the conversion which preceded and accompanied that sacrament.

GREGORY OF NYSSA. 'That we receive a salutary *birth* γεννησιν by the renovation and change of our nature, is manifest to all.'[1] This 'birth' is of course a *new* birth or regeneration; and, as is usual with the fathers, it is here made equivalent to renovation. The new 'birth' obviously means the moral change.

AUGUSTINE—in a passage before quoted, uses the word renovation as equivalent to regeneration—'the *renovation* after the image of God is not effected in a moment, like *that* regeneration in baptism, which is done in a moment:' the language implies that 'renovation after the image of God' is a 'regeneration,' yet a different one from 'that regeneration' which is conferred at the font; it also declares that our moral regeneration, here called renovation, is gradual, 'not effected in a moment.' In another place, he says, 'in baptized infants, the *sacrament* of *regeneration* goes before; and if they persevere in christian piety, *conversion* of heart will follow, the *mystery* [or symbol] of which was previously received in the body:' in this passage, the 'sacrament' is the same as the 'mystery,' and 'sacrament of regeneration' is the same as 'mystery of conversion;' elsewhere, he uses the very phrase 'sacrament of conversion;' hence, Augustine is to be understood as saying, that in baptized infants the sacrament or mystery goes before, and regeneration or conversion follows; in other words, the moral change is regeneration, regeneration is conversion, and, in infants, comes *after* its sacrament in baptism. To the same effect, he says that this change *pre-*

[1] Suicer on Αγακτινισμος.

ceded baptism in the case of Cornelius; 'spiritual *sanctification* by the gift of the Holy Spirit went before, and the *sacrament* of regeneration by the laver of baptism came after:' the meaning of the passage is, Cornelius first underwent the moral change of 'regeneration' or 'spiritual sanctification,' and then received the 'sacrament' of that change.[1] It seems clear, from these extracts, that Augustine regarded regeneration as separable from its sacrament, as a moral change, as identical with renovation, conversion, spiritual sanctification, and as a gradual process, while yet he speaks of a regeneration in baptism effected in a moment. We do not say that he held the doctrine of regeneration as we do; other passages contradict, or seem to contradict, that idea; but we may justly argue, that his falling spontaneously into such language as we have quoted, is a confirmation of our views of the subject.

1 Inglis on Inf. Bapt. *p.* 4. Wall, *V.* 1. *p.* 188. That Augustine distinguished and separated the sacrament from the regeneration, the sign from the thing signified, is evident in other places. 'And that which is not done on that day, but was done a long time ago, is spoken of as done on that day, because the sacrament of it is then celebrated. Was not Christ in his own person offered up once for all? and yet in the sacrament he is offered among the people, not only every Easter, but every day; nor does he lie, who being asked, says, He is offered. For *sacraments* would not be sacraments, if they had not a resemblance of those *things* whereof they are the sacraments; and from this resemblance they commonly have the names of the *things themselves*. As therefore the sacrament of Christ's body is after a certain fashion (secundum quendam modum) Christ's body, and the sacrament of Christ's blood is Christ's blood; so the sacrament of faith is faith; and to believe is nothing else but to have faith. And so when an infant that has not yet the faculty [affectum, disposition] of faith, is said to believe; he is said to have *faith*, because of the *sacrament* of faith; and to *turn* to God, because of the *sacrament* of conversion..... as he is said to believe, so he is called a believer, not from his having the *thing* itself in his mind, but from his receiving the *sacrament* of it.' (Aug. ad Bonif. see Wall, *V.* 1. *p.* 201.)

CHAPTER IV.—SECTION 3.

THE THEORY—NO REGENERATION BUT IN BAPTISM.

Many divines regard baptismal regeneration as the only one in this life. Previous piety, or the repentance and faith required, is not considered as regeneration till baptism is performed. An unworthy adult is supposed to have his regeneration suspended, till, through repentance and faith, he becomes godly. And in infants, as they are incapable of godliness, regeneration is held to be complete without it, in virtue of baptism alone: as Bishop White remarks, 'no considerate person supposes, that in infant baptism, any moral change is wrought on the mind of the infant.'[1] Some add to this theory the further one, that the *seed* of sanctification, the first principle, or 'beginning of the spiritual life,' to grow or die subsequently as the event may prove, is deposited by the Spirit in baptism, which deposite is regeneration. To the latter opinion we do not accede, because the seed of sanctification has already been deposited and has grown, the spiritual (though not the covenant) life has already begun, in all who come to baptism with repentance and faith, as is required of adults. And from the whole theory we dissent, because it makes this regeneration a different thing in the adult, from what it is in the infant; in the one, requiring personal religious character, as an essential ingredient; in the other, dispensing with that ingredient, infants having no personal character, whether good or bad. For this reason, besides others already mentioned, we prefer the theory of two *distinct* regenerations, the baptismal and the moral.

1 Lect. on the Catech. *p.* 218.

But our object, in recurring to this topic, is to show that the divines who restrict the term 'regeneration' to baptism, are far from disallowing the necessity of a change of character, in all baptized persons who do not walk worthy of their christian profession. They call this change renovation, or conversion, and sometimes come very near calling it regeneration. So far the difference between them and the present writer is but in words.

Bishop Mant, conspicuous as an advocate for regeneration in baptism exclusively, says of conversion—'Every unbeliever and every sinner, *although* made by baptism a member of Christ and a child of God, must be, in a certain sense, *converted*, if he would ultimately succeed to his inheritance of the kingdom of heaven.' Again—'In the nature of the thing, and in the method of its being effected, where previous habits of irreligion and worldly-mindedness render it necessary, I trust we do not materially differ—understanding that it consists in 'the actual reformation of the heart and character; that the author of this happy change is the Holy Spirit, but that it is generally effected, and is always to be sought after, in the diligent use of the appointed means of grace; that it is no instantaneous operation, which finishes the whole business of religion at once, but that it is the serious commencement of a work, which it requires the vigorous exertions of the whole life to complete,—considering conversion, I say, in this light, I can cheerfully concur with our brethren in maintaining the *necessity* of such a *change* to every one, who is satisfied with mere nominal christianity, or with any thing short of true christian holiness both of heart and life.'[1]

Bishop Seabury, who remarks, 'we are regenerate and born, or adopted into the family or church of God by bap-

[1] Mant's Appeal to the Gospel, *p.* 395, 400: also Mant's Tracts, *p.* 60, 65.

tism,' and calls it 'the sacrament of regeneration,' and declares 'there is no other way of being born again made known to us, but what Christ has instituted, baptism with water and the Spirit'—addresses thus his baptized hearers —'If what hath been said serves, in any degree, to impress on you the necessity of that spiritual circumcision, or *change of heart and life* which is meant by the *new creature* . . . . . make this a New Year in the christian sense of that word, by becoming *new creatures*, by putting on the *new man*, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.'[1]

Bishop White says—'What would be a falling away in an adult subject of baptism, would be the same in him [an infant growing up:] and in either case there is required a *renewing unto repentance*.' Again: 'The author of these remarks gives a caution against the misunderstanding of them, as though there were denied the hereditary corruption of human nature, or as though there were affirmed any holy affection or desire in man, otherwise than through the operation of the Divine Spirit; effecting what is called 'the putting off the old man with his deeds, and the putting on of the *new man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him who *created* him.[2]

Bishop Inglis, the first bishop of Nova Scotia, thus writes of baptism—'In that ordinance indeed our state is changed; but our nature must be changed also. I called that change of state by the name of regeneration; but mistake me not, as if I meant by that a *renovation of the heart*, without which a change of our state will avail nothing to salvation. I gave it that name, because I judged it most agreeable to the style of scripture, and the language of the primitive christians, and of our reformers. But I am not anxious about names. Call this *inward change*, this growth in

1 Seabury's Serm. (*edit.* 1815) *V.* 1. *p.* 105, 109, 111. *V.* 2. *p.* 174, 176.
2 Lect. on the Catech. *p.* 219.

grace, by the name of regeneration, renovation, or what else you please, I am content. If you have but the *thing* itself, you may express it by what word you think most suitable.'[1]

Bishop Hobart thus writes, on the distinction, made by him and other divines, between regeneration and renovation. 'Episcopalians maintain baptismal regeneration in this sense, that the baptized person is born again, not in the affections of his soul, but into a new state, in which he receives conditionally a title to the blessings of the gospel covenant. But do Episcopalians, therefore, deny the necessity of the 'renewing of the mind?' God forbid! No; they maintain, that unless in the baptized person, by the power of that Holy Spirit a title to which is conferred in baptism, the 'old man be buried and the *new* man raised up;' unless 'all sinful affections die in him, and all things belonging to the Spirit do live and grow in him;' unless the 'old man be crucified, and the whole body of sin abolished;' unless he 'die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness;' unless he thus be '*renewed* by the Holy Ghost,' his baptismal regeneration will only aggravate his guilt and increase his condemnation. The advocate of baptismal regeneration may, therefore, consistently maintain the necessity of the *new birth* in its strongest spiritual sense.'[2]

In Bishop Hobart's Works, published since his decease, there is a sermon on baptism, in which it is explicitly and repeatedly declared, that, though 'born again' in that sacrament, christians must *also* be 'born again' to a new life, 'born again' after relapsing into sin, nay, 'born again' to every growth or stage of holy living. This unquestionably is moral regeneration, and moral regeneration repeated again and again, under scarcely another name. And it is

[1] Inglis on Inf. Bapt. *p.* 173. [2] Hobart's Apol. *p.* 238.

declared, under the name of 'renewing,' to be 'entirely distinct from the regeneration of baptism.'[1]

On this subject we need not multiply quotations. The necessity of a change of the heart and life, from sin to holiness, whether called conversion, renovation, regeneration, or by other names, is fully and always asserted, as by christians generally, so by all Episcopalians. Those who will not believe this, are 'willingly ignorant.'—We ask leave to use the name moral regeneration, both because it is substantially scriptural, and because it sets in the strongest scriptural light the necessity of this change: but we do not permit ourselves to feel the slightest alienation from our brethren, who use a different nomenclature, or who use this otherwise than as we do.

CHAPTER IV.—SECTION 4.

THE THEORY—THAT THE GRACE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION IS OF A MORAL KIND.

Of those who make baptism the only regeneration in this life, some regard that grace as only a *privilege;* while others deem it an *influence*, or at least a deposite which is figuratively termed the seed or germ of moral influence,

1 Hobart's Works, *V.* 2. *p.* 60, 61, &c. It is possible that this sermon, containing a phraseology so entirely at variance with Bp. Hobart's matured opinions on the subject, as set forth in the sermons on Regeneration and Renovation at the end of the volume, may have been one of his early productions: as was also his Apology.—In Serm. 32. *V.* 3. *p.* 390, he says, 'To be born of the Spirit, she [the church] lays down as the characteristic of all the *true* children of God.' In an editorial introduction to a reprint of Bp. Bradford on Regeneration, in the Churchman's Magazine, (*V.* 5. *p.* 125,) it is said of our church—'On the authority of scripture and primitive writers, she distinguishes between *baptismal* regeneration and *spiritual* regeneration, or more properly, between regeneration and renovation.'

which seed or germ is the beginning or first principle of the spiritual life.[1] On the former opinion, enough has been said in Chapter II. sect. 3. To the latter, there are the obvious objections—1. That in unworthy adults, baptized, and continuing unworthy, and in persons innumerable baptized in infancy, there is *no evidence* whatever of any moral influence, or seed of such influence, being deposited in the soul—and 2. That when worthy adults are baptized, their good character shows that they have the seed or germ of moral influence *before* baptism; their spiritual life has begun before they reach the font.

The first objection is—that in unworthy adults, baptized, and continuing unworthy, and in persons innumerable baptized in infancy, there is *no evidence* whatever of any moral influence, or seed of such influence, being deposited in the soul. This objection is sometimes met with the reply, that such persons rebel against the grace given in baptism, or fall from it, either entirely, or for a season; being afterwards restored. But the point is, *was* the seed of moral grace given in baptism? this is not to be taken for granted: what then is the proof? Obviously there is none of a practical kind, to be gathered from the life and conduct.[2] Is it then to be found in scripture? we there learn

1 Lord Bacon, in his Confession of Faith, (Schol. Arm. *V.* 1. *p.* 6.) says—'which seed of the Holy Ghost first *figureth* in us the image of Christ, slain or crucified, through a lively faith; and then reneweth in us the image of God in holiness and charity.' The illustration 'figureth' is beautiful as a metaphor; (see Isa. xliv. 13.) but whether it be accurate or fallacious we cannot say, because it is metaphor only. If applied to baptism, it relieves perhaps the theory before us of the notion of a moral *influence* deposited in that rite. But we know not that any of its advocates have adopted the illustration, or whether such a metaphor could be allowed.

2 Bishop Hobart says (Works *V.* 3. *p.* 383.)—'We know the operation of the wind only by its *effects*. In like manner, according to this analogy, which our blessed Lord employed, the operations of the Holy Spirit are inscrutable, and to be known only by their *fruits*. This is a standard of judgment which cannot deceive us. The possession of the fruits of the Spirit is

only that the Spirit baptizes us; but whether he acts, in that rite, by depositing a moral *influence*, or the seed of it, or by conferring only the spiritual *privilege* of initiation into the church and covenant, is not expressly declared. If we proceed further, to inferences from scripture, we see, we have largely seen, that holy character is not essential to the new birth of baptism; of course moral grace, to produce holy character, is not essential to it. The result is, that there is *no* evidence that moral influence, or the seed of it, is the grace of baptismal regeneration.

The other objection is, if possible, more decidedly fatal to the theory under consideration. An unbaptized adult, long pious in all matters except conforming to the sacraments, and concerning that branch of duty in involuntary error, comes to baptism—and he is told that *then*, and not before, he *begins* the 'spiritual life.' What is he to understand by this language? Were not his previous repentance and faith, and obedience and love, spiritual acts, acts indicating that his 'spiritual life' had commenced? If not, the word 'spiritual' is used in the lower sense; and the 'spiritual life' must mean only the covenant life, or the title estate, described in this essay—it being added, that the deposite of the moral germ is necessary to the covenant title. But the question then recurs, has not the phrase 'spiritual life' a higher sense, besides this lower one? Surely it has: the phrase is not from scripture, but of usage only; and usage gives it the higher signification, as well as the lower. The result is, that a man may be well advanced in *that* 'spiritual life' which is the progresssive change from sin to holiness, before he has begun *that* 'spiritual life' which is the covenant estate: this would

an infallible evidence of his sanctifying presence in our souls. By *no other criterion* can we determine whether we are led by the Spirit.'—By parity of reasoning, it is clear that the only evidence of the deposite of the seed of moral grace in baptism, is the production of *fruit*. On *all* subjects but this one, such reasoning is deemed incontrovertible, by all except fanatics.

be almost the same as the theory maintained in this essay, though in other words. But the further result is, that the seed of moral grace has been planted, and has grown largely, in the one 'spiritual life,' yet that the seed of moral grace must *again* be planted, to produce the other 'spiritual life.' And this we deem an incongruity fatal to the theory.

May we be allowed to suggest, without incurring the imputation of arrogance, that much of the obscurity that has involved the subject of regeneration, has arisen from confused notions of the 'operation' of the Holy Ghost in baptism? That sacrament is called regeneration in scripture; regeneration is a work of the Spirit; and the action of the Spirit must be—what? of a morally sanctifying tendency, it was generally thought. Yet the incongruity was perceived between this doctrine and notorious fact, in multitudes of the baptized. Hence, on the one hand, Jerome, true to scripture, declares—'there is no baptism without the Holy Spirit'—'there is no baptism of the church without the Holy Spirit'—'there is no baptism of Christ without the Holy Spirit'—'the Holy Spirit, whom we assert to be given in true baptism.' Hence, on the other hand, Augustine, yielding to the apparent counter evidence of fact, concedes—'that even may be baptism from which the Holy Spirit is absent' (se aufert, takes himself away)—yet he says, 'if baptism may not be without the Spirit, even heretics have the Spirit . . . . and so have the covetous'—but he further says, 'if however the covetous have not the Spirit of God, and yet have baptism, baptism may be without the Spirit'—while he nevertheless affirms, that the 'sanctity' of baptism is not polluted by even the grossest unworthiness of both the minister and the person receiving it.[1] This discrepancy between Jerome and Augustine,

[1] These quotations from Jerome and Augustine, are in Waterland on Regeneration, *p.* 22. (Weller Tracts.)

and of Augustine with himself, appears to have drawn forth from Waterland the following, among other remarks—'It is certain in the general, that the Holy Spirit, *some way or other*, has a hand in every true and valid baptism'—'As the Holy Spirit consecrates and sanctifies the waters of baptism, giving them an outward and relative holiness; so he *consecrates* the persons also in an outward and relative sense, whether *good or bad*, by a sacred *dedication* of them to the worship and service of the whole Trinity: which consecration is *for ever binding*, and has its effect:'[1] this consecration however, by the Spirit, he regards as different from regeneration. Shall we be deemed presumptuous in expressing the opinion, that Augustine and Waterland offer but confused ideas of the agency of the Spirit in baptism? The obscurity of the former appears to have arisen from the belief that the spiritual effect of baptism was of a moral kind. But Waterland allows an act of the Spirit which is not moral, in that sacrament. Where however is the authority for distinguishing the baptismal 'consecration' by the Spirit, from baptismal regeneration? Where the authority, for connecting essentially *two* acts of the Spirit with baptism? Where the authority, for saying that this baptismal 'consecration,' as distinguished from baptismal regeneration, 'is for ever binding, and has its effect?' And if the Spirit 'dedicates' the person, who gives himself up to be dedicated by the minister, i. e. if the Spirit ratifies or accepts this dedication, then we must ask, what is the *kind* of dedication intended by the minister, and ratified by the Holy Ghost? it is, argues Waterland, to the *duties* implied in 'the worship and service of the whole Trinity.' True; but are there no *privileges* in that service—to be a member of Christ—to be the child of God and of the light, born

[1] Waterland on Regen. *p.* 23.

again—to be an heir of everlasting salvation? And is not 'dedication' to the duties, 'consecration' also to the privileges? If not, to what else is a person 'consecrated' by the Spirit in baptism? If such however be the baptismal dedication and consecration, then the doctrine is acknowledged, in other words, that all the baptized, 'whether good or bad,' are children of God. To the doctrine thus involuntarily conceded—may we not say so?—to that doctrine we refer, as the solution of all difficulties. We affirm, with Jerome, that there is no true baptism without the Holy Spirit. And we think we scatter the obscurities of the subject, besides agreeing with scripture most abundantly adduced, by asserting, that the 'operation' of the Spirit in that sacrament is *not* a moral one—that baptismal regeneration has no affinity, in nature, with the grace which changes the heart.

To finish this argument: How can we believe that moral, converting, sanctifying, renovating grace comes through *various means*, and yet restrict the seed of that grace, its initial principle, to baptism? A Pagan receives the Bible, reads also its doctrines in a summary or liturgy, hears those doctrines from a Frumentius not ordained, believes them, prays, repents, obeys as far as he can, but has no access to baptism: what is his case? has his 'spiritual life' begun? is he transformed, in any degree, by the renewing of his mind? If *not*, what more would he be, in the moral sense, by immediate baptism? If, however, through the word of God and prayer, he *be* thus entered and advanced in things spiritual, baptism *cannot* have been the commencement, the seed, the germ, the first principle, the principle in any sense, of his regenerate change of character.

CHAPTER IV.—SECTION 5.

THE THEORY OF THE TWO REGENERATIONS.

The doctrine of the two distinct regenerations, which, adopting expressions already in use, we have termed 'baptismal' and 'moral,' is not exactly new.[1] Though approached only, and in a confused manner perhaps, by some, and held by others in a way not fully coincident with what we deem the accurate exposition, it has been both so approached and so maintained as to secure us from the charge of innovation. This position we are now to illustrate.

Those who maintain that baptized infants are regenerate, independently of personal character, yet that adults coming to baptism are *not* regenerate without holy personal character, allow in effect that there are two kinds of regeneration, though they ascribe them both to baptism.

It is conceded by Waterland that the word regeneration has a 'stricter' and a 'larger' sense; and these two senses

1 'Baptismal Regeneration' is a common phrase: that of 'Moral Regeneration' occurs in Paley's Works, *V.* 4. *p.* 345.—On the subject of new developments in theology, may the author be permitted to offer the following extracts from Abp. Whately? (on St. Paul, *p.* 17, 19.) After remarking that the love of novelty or originality is one obstacle to the love of truth, he subjoins—'Others again, and they are more numerous, are unduly biassed by an excessive respect for venerated authority;—by an undue regard for any belief that is ancient,—that is established,—that has been maintained by eminent men: they are overpowered, in short, by the 'argumentum ad verecundiam.' I mean not, of course, that the judgment of able men, and that of numerous independent authorities, furnishes no valid argument; only, that it should not supersede argument:—that every other description of evidence should be called in;—and that we should not think ourselves bound to adopt an opinion merely because it has been held by many before us'..... 'True wisdom would tell us not to receive one opinion because it is *old*, and another because it is *new*; but to receive and reject none on either ground, and to inquire sedulously in each case what is *true*.'

he exemplifies from Augustine. May we not ask, whether using a word in two *senses* is not generally equivalent to using that word for two *things?* 'St. Austin followed the *stricter* sense when he said, Simon the sorcerer was born of water and the Spirit. In another place, he followed the *larger* sense, which takes in renovation .... He who is born of God has charity [love]—let him see whether he have charity, and then let him say, I am born of God.—Let him have charity; otherwise he may not say that he is born of God.'[1]

Bishop Taylor has the following passage—'There are in scripture noted *two* births besides the natural; to which also by analogy we may add a *third*. The first is to be born of water and the spirit. It is one thing signified by two substantives, water and the spirit, that is, *spiritus aqueus*, the spirit moving upon the waters of baptism. The second is to be born of spirit and fire, for so Christ was promised to baptize us with the Holy Ghost and with fire; that is, *cum spiritu igneo*, with a fiery Spirit, the Spirit as it descended in Pentecost in the shape of fiery tongues. And as the watery spirit washed away the sins of the church, so the spirit of fire enkindles charity and the love of God. The spirit is the same under both the titles, and it enables the church with gifts and graces. And from these there is another operation of the new birth, but the same spirit, the spirit of rejoicing, or *spiritus exultans*, *spiritus lætitiæ*.'[2] Bishop Taylor here makes, at least oratorically, *three* regenerations, one apparently mixed, both baptismal and moral, the second moral only, the third relating to the happiness produced by the moral change. For calling the third a new birth, there is no scriptural authority: and Bishop Taylor adds it only 'by analogy.' And the first two of these new births are either the same with those we

[1] Waterland on Justification, *p.* 46. (Weller Tracts.)
[2] Taylor's Serm. *V.* 2. *p.* 15, 16.

have described, or may, we think, be resolved into them, with great advantage on the score of perspicuity.

Whitfield allows the distinction between the birth of water, and that of the Spirit. 'Now a person may be said to be 'in Christ' *two ways*. First, only by an outward profession: and in this sense, every one that is called a christian, or baptized into Christ's church, may be said to be 'in Christ.' But that this is not the sole meaning of the apostle's phrase now before us, (2 Cor. v. 17.) is evident, because then 'every one that names the name of Christ,' or is baptized into his visible church, would be 'a new creature,' which is notoriously false; it being but too plain, beyond all contradiction, that comparatively but few of those that are *born of water*, are *born of the Spirit likewise*.'[1]

Doddridge applies the passage, 'born of water and of the Spirit,' to baptism and renewing, and says—'being born of the Spirit, he will also be solicitous that he may be *born of water*, and so fulfil all righteousness'—again, 'when a baptized person is destitute of true religion, that *birth* which he had by water, seems to me as it were an evanescent thing.' He allows a birth by water, as well as a birth of the Spirit; yet he does seem to be aware that the former must be a *new* birth as well as the latter, both being different from the natural birth; and accordingly he does not hold baptism to be regeneration.[2] We regard the baptismal change as more than a birth by water; 'we are all baptized by the Spirit;' and Doddridge allows the 'adoption' of the Israelites (Rom. ix. 4,) to have been a 'spiritual adoption.' But, his deficiency on that point excepted, we claim this divine as bearing adminicular testimony to our doctrine.

A similar claim we have to the authority of Macknight; who says—'except a man be *born of water*, that is, *bap-*

[1] Whitfield's Sermons, *V.* 1. *p.* 3. (24*mo. Phila. B. Franklin*, 1740.)

[2] Doddridge on John iii. 5: and on Regen. *Postscript, p.* xiii. xii.

tized, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; unless a man has a new nature given him by the Spirit, which is being *born of the Spirit*, and publicly receive the christian religion when offered to him, which is being *born of water*, he cannot be a subject of God's kingdom here, nor have a share in his glory hereafter.' The *two births* are distinctly recognized, though they are not called new births or regenerations. Like Doddridge also, Macknight forgets the agency of the Spirit in the birth of water. In the following extract, commended by T. H. Horne, Macknight makes a much nearer approach to our doctrine; but he does not use the word regenerate, or refer to the Spirit as conferring church-membership. 'The high titles above mentioned; namely, the *sons of God*, the *children of God*, the elect of God, the *adoption of sons*, the election, saints, a holy nation, a royal priesthood, and a peculiar people, were anciently given to the Israelites as a nation, merely on account of their being the *visible church* and people of God, without any regard to the personal character of the individuals of whom that nation was composed. Under the gospel the *same high titles* were bestowed on *whole churches*, merely on account of their profession of christianity, without any regard to the personal character of the individuals who composed these churches. But these high titles, with some others of greater importance, such as, the *begotten of God*, the *heirs of God*, the *adoption*, were given in an appropriated sense to individuals likewise, on account of their *faith* and *holiness*. When given to whole churches, these titles imported *nothing more* but that the society to which they were given was a *church* of Christ; and that the individuals of which that society was composed were entitled to all the privileges belonging to the visible church and people of God. But when appropriated to individuals, these titles implied that the parsons to whom they were given were really *partakers of the*

nature of God by possessing his moral qualities, and that they were the objects of his paternal love, and heirs of his felicity . . . . When John saith in the verse before us, Every one who doeth righteousness hath been *begotten of God*, by restricting the title to individuals of a specific character, he teaches us that the persons of whom he speaks are *sons of God in the highest sense*, and heirs of eternal life.'[1]— The approach to our doctrine is very near; but Dr. M. seems to have avoided calling baptism an actual regeneration. We do not perceive that 'begotten of God' is a title 'of greater importance' than 'sons of God,' or 'the adoption of sons' than 'the adoption;' and the title, 'heirs of God through Christ,' is given, we have seen, to the Galatian churches, though severely censured for being deficient in moral regeneration. We find therefore, in this extract, nothing to weaken our doctrine; and it certainly goes far to confirm it.

In Poole's Annotations, two *adoptions* are mentioned—one, making all Israel the children of God—the other, producing the moral change, and its joys and consolations. So likewise in Matthew Henry.[2]

Dean Comber says—'And because persons, come to age before their conversion, are first taught and persuaded by the word of God, the language of holy writ enlarges the metaphor, and saith, such are '*begotten* by the word of God,' (1 Cor. iv. 15,) and *then* born again or *regenerated* in or by baptism.'[3]

The authorities thus far quoted do but furnish approximations to our doctrine. There is another class of divines who have held it very nearly, perhaps, as we do—we

1 Macknight on John iii. 5; and on 1 John ii. 29: see also on Rom. viii. 14. Tit. iii. 5.

2 Poole's Annot. on Rom. ix. 4. viii. 15: and M. Henry on the same texts.

3 See Bishop Brownell's Prayer-book.

cannot agree with the first two, however, in calling baptismal regeneration 'external.'

Of this class we name first Bishop Hopkins, of Raphoe. 'There is an external, relative, or ecclesiastical sanctification; which is nothing else, but the devoting or giving up of a thing or person unto God, by those who have power so to do. There is an internal, real, and spiritual sanctification: and in this sense, a man is said to be sanctified, when the Holy Ghost doth infuse into his soul the habits of divine grace, and maketh him partaker of the divine nature, whereby he is inwardly qualified to glorify God in a holy life.'—'Baptism is the immediate means of our external and relative sanctification unto God .... as it is the solemn admission of persons into the visible church; as it separates them from the world, and from all false religions in it, and brings them out of the visible kingdom of the devil, into the visible kingdom of Jesus Christ .... But this is only a relative sanctity, not a real: and many such saints and sanctified men there are, who shall never enter into heaven; but by their wicked lives, forfeit and lose that blessed inheritance to which they were called .... Such a baptismal regeneration as this is must needs be acknowledged by all that will not wilfully shut their eyes against the clear evidence of scripture.' 'The apostle tells us, that to the Israelites as they were a church, pertained *the adoption:* now adoption is making men sons of God: yet, certainly, they did not all of them enjoy the *heavenly* and effectual *adoption*, which would bring them all to the heavenly and glorious inheritance.' 'The whole economy and dispensation of the kingdom of Christ is managed by the *Spirit* of Christ: so that those, who are *internally* sanctified, are *regenerated* by *his* effectual operation: and those who are only *externally* sanctified, are *regenerated* by *his* public institution. Infants, therefore, are in baptism regenerated by the Holy

Ghost, because the Holy Spirit of God appoints this ordinance to receive them into the visible church, which is the regenerate part and state of the world.' 'Those who are baptized may, in this ecclesiastical and relative sense, be truly called saints, the children of God, and members of Christ, and thereupon inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.'[1]

Bishop Bradford, in his sermon on Tit. iii. 5. has the following passages. 'The words born and born again plainly answer to regeneration in my text; as *water* and the *Spirit* answer to the washing of *regeneration* and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost.'—'This inquiry .... will lead us to the understanding of the true notion of regeneration, *both* when it is applied to *baptism* (as it frequently is) and when it particularly denotes the *renewing* of the mind by the divine Spirit. This inquiry will also serve to convince us that *external regeneration*, unless accompanied with the *internal*, with the renewing of the Holy Ghost, will not avail us to the end for which it is designed.'—'There can be no great doubt, that our Saviour and St. Paul used the expressions, *born again of water*, and the *washing of regeneration*, in the very same sense.'—'This change [renewing] is what our Lord himself means by *born of the Spirit* as well as *water*, in order to entering into the kingdom of God.'—'What St. Paul says of the Jews may be applied to christians also, with a little variation of the words. He is not a christian which is one outwardly; neither is that *regeneration* (namely, such as will be effectual to salvation) which is *outward* in the flesh; but he is a christian which is one inwardly; and *regeneration* is that of the *heart*, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God.' We are aware that Bishop Bradford is sometimes claimed by those who allow but the one regeneration

[1] Bp. Hopkins' Works, (*London*, 1809.) *V.* 2. *p.* 418—418, 423—422—426—423.

of baptism, and call the change of heart by other names; and the greater part of his discourse is certainly to that effect. But as certainly he applies the name regeneration to the moral change, in these extracts; and the title, 'A Discourse concerning *Baptismal* and *Spiritual* Regeneration,' decides that by the latter he meant renewing.[1]

The Society [in England] for Promoting Christian Knowledge published several editions of the sermon just mentioned: that of 1810 had prefixed to it the following advertisement—'This seventh edition is published at a time, when it is hoped that so judicious and scriptural a discourse may be of service to settle the minds of good christians, in some present disputes concerning *baptismal* and *spiritual* regeneration.'[2] Subsequently, the Society abandoned this tract, and appear to have changed their theory of regeneration. Their previous sanction however, of Bishop Bradford's sermon, shows that the doctrine of the two regenerations is not new, but had, for a long time, most respectable authority.

Mr. Baxter says—'All that the minister warrantably baptizeth are *sacramentally regenerate*, and are, *in foro ecclesiæ*, members of Christ, and children of God, and heirs of heaven. But it is only those that are sincerely delivered up in covenant to God in Christ, that are *spiritually and really regenerate*, and are such as shall be owned for members of Christ and children of God, *in foro cœli*.'[3]

The phrase 'put on Christ' is equivalent to 'put on the new man,' and that means renewing or the new creation, which is synonymous with regeneration. Now, the apostle says in one passage, 'as many as have been baptized

1 Churchman's Magazine, *V.* 5. *p.* 128, 129, 131, 282, 125. The republication of the discourse in this Magazine vouches for its authority (in 1808) among Episcopalians in this country. It deserves another reprint among us.

2 J. Scott on Baptism, *p.* 205.

3 Baxter's Pract. Works, *V.* 1. *p.* 559.

into Christ *have* put on Christ;' yet in another place he exhorts the baptized, '*put ye* on the Lord Jesus Christ.' This is well interpreted by St. Augustine, 'Christ is sometimes put on as far as the reception of the sacrament, and sometimes [put on] unto the sanctification of the life; the former is common to the good and the wicked, the other is peculiar to the good.' When it is thus said that a baptized person *has* put on Christ, and yet *must* put on Christ, what is it but declaring, in other words, that there are two regenerations, the one in baptism, the other the moral change.[1]

We suppose the meaning of Dr. Jarvis is similar, when after suggesting that resurrection and regeneration are convertible terms, he says—'In the largest acceptation of the word, all baptized persons are risen with Christ. They are made members of his body, the church. They have risen from an uncovenanted, to a covenanted state. They are translated into God's kingdom. From being aliens and foreigners, they are admitted to be fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. They are allowed to partake of all the means of grace, and if they have come with right motives, all the hopes of glory. In a less extensive sense, or rather in the most complete acceptation of the metaphor, they only are risen with Christ who are risen from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness. This spiritual resurrection of our nature, through the powerful assistances afforded us under the new covenant, must take place in this life, or we shall never attain unto that final and proper resurrection, in which our souls shall be for ever united to bodies fashioned like unto the glorious body of our Redeemer.' 'It has been shown that the word resurrection, and consequently its synonyme *regeneration*, is a complex term; that it denotes not only the outward and

[1] Gal. iii. 27. Rom. xiii. 14. Waterland, *p.* 22. J. Scott, *p.* 192

visible resurrection from an uncovenanted to a covenanted state, but also that process of spiritual renovation, by which our nature is figuratively said to die unto sin, and live again unto righteousness.' 'To be born of water, is equivalent to the outward and visible resurrection, in baptism, by which men are admitted into the kingdom of God on earth, the visible church; to be born of the Spirit, is equivalent to that inward and spiritual resurrection, which is effected in our souls by the Spirit of God, and without which we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.' 'So we his members are first declared to be the sons of God at our baptism. In a higher sense we are in this life declared to be the sons of God by the fruits of the Spirit in our lives. In the highest sense, we shall be declared to be the sons of God when we shall become the children of the resurrection.'[1]

Under the sanction of such authority, we have felt amply sustained in offering again to the members of our church, and to christians generally, the doctrine of two regenerations, baptismal and moral, each of a distinct nature from the other.

CHAPTER IV.—SECTION 6.

MORAL REGENERATION GRADUAL, AND CAPABLE OF REPETITION.

Much evil has arisen from regarding regeneration, in the now popular or moral sense, as a single act of the Holy Spirit. Although christians of a calm disposition judge chiefly by the life and conversation whether that act has occurred, enthusiasts appeal rather to the feelings, and require in these a *token*, usually of strong agitations, often

[1] Dr. Jarvis' Serm. &c. *p.* 63, 64, 72, 65, 61.

of terrors, ending in rapture, before they allow a person to be considered as regenerate. And this token once perceived, the individual is unreservedly classed among the pious; and calvinists add, that he is now, to human judgment, marked for final perseverance. We prefer however, the doctrine that personal religion is a *gradual* attainment, a spark that may often appear and disappear ere it is effectually kindled, and which may often require, for its perpetuation, and the more perfect refining away of our dross, kindling anew from heaven. Such a view of moral regeneration, that it includes the commencement, the whole progress, and the completion, of our holy change, we have proved from scripture. We now adduce authorities to strengthen this interpretation of the inspired declarations on the subject.

Archbishop Tillotson, after asserting that 'regeneration and sanctification are but different expressions of the selfsame thing,' proceeds thus—'It is said that regeneration only signifies our first entrance into this state [of grace and holiness,] and sanctification our progress and continuance in it.' But this is a great mistake. For though it be true that regeneration doth signify our first entrance into this state, yet it is not true that it *only* signifies that; for it is used likewise in scripture to signify our continuance in that state.' Again—'It is said that one of the main differences between regeneration and sanctification is this, that regeneration is incapable of degrees, and all that are regenerate are equally so .... whereas sanctification is a gradual progress from one degree of holiness to another, and of them that are truly sanctified and holy, one may be more sanctified and holy than another. But this likewise is a mere fancy and imagination, without any real ground. For as an unregenerate state does plainly admit of degrees, so likewise doth the regenerate, and for the same reason .... they that are more holy, and more like God, are

more the children of God; and to be more a child of God, is surely to be more regenerate.' Again—'all the difficulty I know of in this matter is a mere nicety, that there is an instant in which every thing begins, and that therefore regeneration is in an instant; so that the instant before a man arrived at this state, it could not be said that he was regenerate; and the instant after he is in this state, it cannot be denied that he is so. But this is idle subtilty; just as if a man should prove that a house was built in an instant, because it could not be said to be built till the instant it was finished; though for all this, nothing is more certain than that it was built by degrees. . . . . All the while the man is tending towards a regenerate state . . . . the work of regeneration is going on.'[1]

Stackhouse, in his Body of Divinity, and under the head of Regeneration, which he there identifies with renovation, has the following passages. 'We must not imagine that because the author of our *regeneration* is an Almighty agent, the effects of his operations upon our minds are either *instantaneous* or irresistible . . . . this is a work which *cannot* be done in an *instant*, but requires *time*, as well as pains, to bring it to *perfection*.'—'If ye experimentally find that the grace of God's Holy Spirit has *begun* the work of *regeneration* in your souls, has renewed your mind, and tamed your passions, and changed your lives, rejoice and be exceeding glad, because your renovation being thus happily *commenced*, is a good pledge, and reason to hope, that your names shall be written in the book of life.'[2]

In one of the former tracts of the (English) Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Collect for Christmas-day is called 'A Prayer for Regeneration'—which implies

[1] Tillotson's Serm. *fol. V.* 2. *p.* 340, 341, 342.
[2] Stackhouse's Body of Divinity, *p.* 983, 985.

that regeneration is constantly renewed, increased, or repeated. In another, the title of one of the sections is, 'The Beginnings of Regeneration'—indicating that it is a gradual work.[1]

Dr. Hole, though an advocate for baptismal regeneration, takes the same view of the collect for Christmas-day—it 'teaches us to pray, that as he [Christ] was born of our flesh, so we *may be* regenerated and born again of his Holy Spirit; and as he by his incarnation partook of our human nature, so we by spiritual regeneration *may be* partakers of his divine nature.' This exposition of the collect implies that it is a prayer for a perpetually progressive regeneration. We might also have adduced it as an approach, at least, to the doctrine of the two new births: for it represents those who are regenerate in baptism as praying to be regenerated afterwards.

In Bishop Hobart's Bible, on Tit. iii. 5, though the application of the word regenerate to the change of heart is not approved, the following sentence occurs in a note—'regeneration, if it be applied to the whole and entire change of a man, is a *progressive* state, the perfection of which is in another world, the commencement and *degrees* in this.'

Archdeacon Daubeny says—'The more restrained, together with the more *extended* use of the term regeneration, in its application to the first communication of divine grace in baptism; to the *continued supplies* of it in subsequent stages of the christian life; to the *renewal* of it *after forfeiture*; or to some more than ordinary manifestations of it under particular circumstances; constitute that comprehensive doctrine of the Church of England on this important subject, which all her sound divines hold in substance, under whatever terms, or by whatever distinctions, they at different times have thought proper to describe it.'[2]

1 J. Scott on Bapt. *p.* 201, 202.

2 J. Scott on Bapt. *p.* 298.

Dr. Jarvis speaks to the same effect—'If the renovation of our nature be but another term to express its resurrection or regeneration from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, then it will be seen that our spiritual *regeneration* is the process of our *whole mortal life*. It is begun when the Holy Spirit begins to operate upon our minds. It is promoted by the use of all the means of grace, by the preaching and reading of the word of God, by prayer, by the administration of the sacraments, by our very trials and afflictions. While the seeds of sin remain in our nature, our inner man must be renewed from day to day. We must be for ever engaged in purifying our bodies and our souls, and continually becoming more and more perfect until this mortality shall be swallowed up of life.'[1]

Of writers not of our denomination, it will suffice to present the opinion of Calvin, that moral regeneration is a gradual process. He says—'In one word, I apprehend *repentance* to be *regeneration*, the end of which is the restoration of the divine image within us . . . . . in this *regeneration* we are restored by the grace of Christ to the righteousness of God, from which we fell in Adam; in which manner the Lord is pleased *completely* to restore all those whom he adopts to the inheritance of life. And this restoration is not accomplished in a single moment, or day, or year; but by *continual*, and sometimes even *tardy advances*, the Lord destroys the carnal corruptions of his chosen, purifies them from all pollution, and consecrates them as temples to himself; renewing all their senses to real purity, that they may employ their *whole life* in the exercise of repentance, and know that this warfare will be terminated only by death . . . . Thus, therefore, the children of God are liberated by *regeneration* from the servitude of sin,' &c. Again—'Therefore, in the *whole course*

[1] Dr. Jarvis' Serm. &c. *p.* 74, 75.

of regeneration, we are justly styled God's workmanship, created unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.'[1]

Another argument to our purpose is this. Although some divines, Waterland for example, who maintain only one regeneration, deny that it can be 'totally lost,' others appear to hold a different opinion. And those who speak of a fall from the state of regeneracy, without denying a recovery to that state before death, allow something very like a further regeneration, or a repetition of that act. Archdeacon Daubeny approves of calling 'bad christians *unregenerate* men.'[2] Bishop Taylor represents the lapse from the regenerate state in very strong terms, yet without intimating that it was beyond recovery—saying to his baptized hearers—'the question is, whether any man that is covetous or proud, false to his trust, or a drunkard, can at the same time be a child of God? *no*, certainly he cannot' —'he is *not* a child of God, that knowingly and deliberately chooses any thing that God hates.'[3] Yet if such persons savingly repent, they again become children of God. Now, can the regeneration of an adult baptized in sincerity, whether called baptismal or moral, after being *lost* by his falling into deliberate and continued sin, so that he becomes unregenerate and is no longer a child of God, be the same regeneration which makes him *again* a child of God on his final repentance? We see not how this can be. We therefore think, that writers who use such language tacitly allow that regeneration may be repeated; or at least, that, as Dr. Paley says of pardon, it ebbs and flows, which precludes the idea of its being an instantaneous operation of the Spirit, complete in a moment.

As related to this branch of our subject, the following extracts from Bishop Taylor are valuable—'a righteous

1 Calv. Instit. *V.* 2. *p.* 73, 88.
2 J. Scott on Bapt. *p.* 298.
3 Taylor's Serm. *V.* 3. *p.* 51, 54.

man is justified when he is saved; and a weak christian is justified when his imperfect services are accepted for the present, and himself thrust forward to more grace; and he that is justified may be justified more; &c. . . . when the faith is such that justification is the product and correspondent, as that faith may be imperfect, so the justification is but begun, and either must proceed further, or else, as the faith will die, so the justification will come to nothing.' Again—'No man's sins are pardoned, but in the same measure in which they are mortified, destroyed and taken away; so that if faith does not cure our sinful natures, it can never justify, it never can procure our pardon.'[1]

Having sustained—we trust sufficiently—our interpretation of the scriptures on which we base this part of our doctrine, we proceed to some further remarks.

By regarding moral regeneration as a gradual, not an instantaneous change, the moment of its commencement becomes a subject of far less importance, than it is made by some divines who apply the word to that moment only, and call the subsequent stages of the renewing process, sanctification, or the like. Doubtless there is a point of time at which gracious influence first becomes successful, and the holy change begins; it is known in all cases to the Searcher of hearts; and occasionally, perhaps, it may be discerned by the person so changed. And if the change continue and go forward, that may be called the moment of passing from a state of moral unregeneracy to the state of moral regeneration. But the moment is so seldom ascertained by men, that it is of little importance in a practical view. And for theoretical or doctrinal use, the importance of the commencing moment is nearly merged in the far superior importance of the graces that open as the good work proceeds, repentance, faith, obedience, love: for only

[1] Taylor's Serm. *V.* 3. *p.* 68, 75.

by these graces can it be known that the new creation has indeed begun. Whatever be the doctrine, not fanatical, built on there being an initial moment of the change, it presumes the fact of the change to be tested by subsequent fruits: and why may not the same doctrine be as well founded on the beginning and progress, unitedly called moral regeneration, or on the progress alone, having that name, as on the mere first moment, with that appellation confined to it, yet requiring this progress as the test? Such a doctrine, whatever it be, is built on the presumed fact that moral regeneration has occurred; but the fact is not presumed, reasonably, without the evidence of a due measure of practical godliness: it may therefore be justly said, that the practical godliness so produced is the real basis of the doctrine, since on that alone is founded the presumption that there *has been* the first moment of moral regeneration.

It is not the purpose of this essay to notice particularly the theories or doctrines that have been connected with the application of the word 'regeneration' to the moral change. The writer may however be permitted to state, that, in his opinion, baptism is the only scriptural title to all the mercies of God through Christ; to the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit; to pardon or justification; to his consoling influences; to his sustaining influences; to heaven. Baptism is called pardon, or justification, or remission of sin, because it is the conditional title to that blessing. And moral regeneration, or the change of heart, in the outset, and in every subsequent stage, may, in the baptized, be called pardon, justification, remission of sin, because it is, so far, a fulfilment of the conditions, and consequently so far making good the title. But it is obvious, that at the first moment much less is fulfilled of the conditions, and much less made good, than there is when the fruits appear and ripen. Hence, the first moment of

moral regeneration may justly be deemed, for all purposes under human cognisance, of importance vastly inferior to the after stages.

So likewise baptism may be called salvation, because it is the conditional title to it. And the same term may be applied to every stage of moral regeneration, because it is, so far, a fulfilment of the conditions, and making good the title.[1]

Should it be objected that this view of the subject amounts to the error of justification by works, the reply is obvious. All who believe in the real liberty of the human will, as well as the sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost, agree that in the first moment of the change from sin to holiness, there is a surrender of the will, whether with a clear consciousness or not, to the movings of the Spirit; of course that surrender is a work: and thus the doctrine of justification at that moment is as much connected with *that* work, as the doctrine of progressive justification is with the works of a progressive moral regeneration. But the *connexion* of justification with works—and who does not connect the two?—by no means implies justification *by* works in either case. Faith being connected with works, and justification being by faith, justification is unavoidably connected with works—'faith without works is dead,' it is not faith—faith, argues St. James, is the 'body,'

1 Under this construction, we agree with Matthew Henry. (On Tit. iii. 5.) 'Here is salvation begun, which will be growing and increasing to perfection; therefore it is said, He saved us.... we must be initially saved now, by regeneration, if on good ground we would expect complete salvation in heaven; the change then will be but in degree, not in kind; grace is glory, and glory is but grace in its perfection. How few mind this? Most carry it as if they were afraid to be happy before the time; they would have heaven, they pretend, at last, yet care not for holiness now, *i. e.* they would have the end without the beginning; so absurd are sinners: but without regeneration, that is the first resurrection, no attaining the second glorious one, the resurrection of the just.'

works the 'spirit'—'by works is faith made perfect.' The work of a surrender of the will at the initial moment, in the former scheme, is a token of faith; and so are the further works, in the latter. And thus both schemes conform to the doctrine of justification by faith. Neither of them allows to either faith or works the least merit before God. Merit is in Christ only—faith accepts his merits—works show the faith to be genuine.

CHAPTER IV.—SECTION 7.

PRACTICAL REMARKS ON MORAL REGENERATION.

It would require a volume to present a full practical illustration and enforcement of the subject of moral regeneration. The limits of this essay will admit, as indeed its purpose requires, only a few select remarks, intended chiefly to guard against misconception and abuses.

We hold the universal necessity of moral regeneration, or the change of heart, in order to an entrance into the kingdom of God in heaven. We hold it as we do the entire doctrine of our Saviour, in his conversation with Nicodemus, 'except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Infants dying unbaptized, persons ignorant of the gospel, or not having access to baptism, or omitting it through involuntary error, are exceptions, we doubt not, to the requirement to be 'born of water.' And we further believe that dying infants, as they are not subjects for the moral change we are describing, enter the kingdom of heaven without it:[1] at

1 Bishop Hopkins, of Raphoe, has the following remarks—'It alone [baptismal or ecclesiastical regeneration] will suffice to the salvation of infants,

least, we account this a just view of that part of scripture —without entering on the mysterious question, how original sin, 'the infection of nature,' is in them expunged? Beyond the case however of young children, (and idiots,) we are not at liberty to except any human being from the necessity of moral regeneration: for scripture teaches, as we have shown, that even among the heathen there are those who are (morally) 'the children of God.'[1] To *all* therefore we declare, 'except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'

Passing by the effects of this holy change on the will, the affections, and the understanding, which are illustrated in various works, we are to notice that its *final test* is a holy life. The passages of scripture, on which is founded the application of the term regeneration to the change of heart, refer all of them to godliness in *practice* and in *principle*. The only other test would be, feelings, whether mere perceptions or strong emotions: but not one of the passages intimates that these are required in moral regeneration. This fact is highly important; for enthusiastic teachers dwell much on the necessity of violent pangs, in order to the accomplishing of the new birth, and not only justify on this ground many improper excesses, but require the calmer christian to force himself into a similar excitement, under the penalty of being accounted void of true piety. But, so far as the metaphor is concerned; besides that the pangs are not in the infant born, there is no more necessity for them in the moral new birth, than in the baptismal, which is wholly unconnected with them. And as to the scriptural tests; they are, we repeat, practical only, including conduct and principles—those who

because they are thereby as holy as their state can make them capable of.' —'For infants, it is not easy to be conceived, what inward work can, in an ordinary manner, pass upon them.' (Works, *V.* 2. *p.* 423, 424.)

[1] John xi. 52; see *ch.* 2. *sect.* 2. of this essay.

fear the Lord, and cultivate peace, and love their enemies, and are benevolent, piously contented, blameless and harmless, those who practise righteousness, and habitually avoid sin, and overcome the world, and keep themselves from the touch of the evil one, those who have laid aside their former lusts, malice, guile, hypocrisies, envies, and evil speakings, and have purified their souls in obeying the truth, those who exercise love to God and men, and faith in Jesus as the Christ, and are led by the Spirit, and have his witness, the humble persuasion that they are sanctified, concurrent with the witness of their good conscience—these, if scripture is to decide, are children of God, born of God, morally regenerate. This reasoning, however, is not intended to disconnect piety and sacred feelings, and courses of feeling: far from us be such an error. Sound christian experience is of prime importance, and a discriminating perception of it is also of great value. Sound penitent experience is based on the general rule, that our sorrow for sin should be proportioned to the amount of sin or neglect that has been indulged in; subject however to an almost unlimited variation, produced by our different degrees of sensibility, by the tone of our religious opinions, by the influence of our pious company, and by other incidental causes. But, while we thus appreciate godly experience, nay, should it be estimated ever so extravagantly, there is no evading the fact, that where scripture applies the phrases born of God, sons of God, born again, new born, and the like, to those who have undergone the change of heart, it recognises as such those who are practically reclaimed from depravity, whether natural or habitual, without a single allusion to pangs, as essential to the change.[1]

[1] St. Paul says to the Galatians, 'my little children, of whom *I travail* in birth again:' this may intimate pangs in the *apostle* in behalf of the Galatians, but it certainly does not refer to any in *them* in their own behalf; all

The test of moral regeneration being a holy life, a 'walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord,' there need be no predominant anxiety as to the particular workings of the mind that have attended this change. If the fruit be good, it may not be doubted that God has made the tree good. If there be in any person, true repentance and obedience towards God, a deep and ardent faith in the merits of Christ, and a watchful dependance on the Holy Spirit, with a faithful waiting upon the several means of grace—in such a person the Most High is effecting the great transformation which is preparing him for heaven, be what they may the operations on the feelings in or by which the Spirit has begun or continues it. In regard to these feelings, penitent exercises of the mind, the fundamental rule, liable as we remarked to various exceptions, is, that they be reasonably proportioned to the amount of sin that has been indulged in, including both wickedness and neglect—the estimate to be made in the spirit of candour, humility, and a tender conscience, not in the spirit of self-excuse—conviction should be proportioned to transgression.[1] And this rule may be illustrated under three heads. 1. Many of the pious enter on their happy course in the earliest periods in which their minds begin to form; being soon taught, and taught effectually, the fear of God and the love of the Saviour. They thus give their fallen nature little indulgence; some-

that can be inferred from this language is, the apostle's anxiety for them, not their anxiety for themselves.

1 We can discern no principle on which it can be alleged that the feeling of conviction should be equal in all persons, or *dis*proportioned to the amount of wickedness or neglect, that will not lead to the inference, that those who have transgressed much and those who have transgressed little are equal in transgression—and to the further inference, that there is no distinction, as our Lord says there is, between being forgiven much and forgiven little. (Luke vii. 42, 43, 47.)

times, as little as is possible with beings, who, with their best and earliest efforts, are yet not free from sin. And from such persons as these, it would be folly to ask a strongly marked or very painful repentance. They *are* changed from the carnal to the spiritual mind; but the change began so early, and has proceeded so gradually and so calmly, that none but the Searcher of hearts could discern its outset or its stages. These, the early pious, though undergoing little of the exercises of the mind called experience, are usually among the best of christians.[1]— 2. Others, after a youth of folly or levity, of neglect, or of youthful sins, begin their more considerate years with a better course; resolving then, through the preventing grace of the Spirit, to serve God, instead of being devoted to mammon or iniquity. The holy change of these persons may be expected to be more perceptible, yet not

1 'We have encouragement to believe there are a considerable number who are, as it were, sanctified from the womb, and in whom the seeds of divine grace are sown, before they grow up to a capacity of understanding the public preaching of the word: a remark, which Mr. Baxter carried so far as to say, 'that he believes if the duties of religious education were conscientiously discharged, preaching would not be God's ordinary method of converting souls: but the greater part would be wrought upon before they were capable of entering into the design of a sermon.' And indeed it seems to me, that children may early come to have some apprehensions of what is most important in religion. They may have a great reverence for God, and a love for him, as that great Father who made them, and that kind Friend who gives them every thing that they have; and though it is not so easy for them to understand the doctrines peculiar to a Redeemer, yet when they hear of Christ as the Son of God, who came down from heaven to teach men and children the way thither; who loved them, and did them good every day, and at last died to deliver them from death and hell; their little hearts may well be impressed with such thoughts as these, and they may find a growing desire to be instructed in what Christ is, and what he taught and did, and to do what shall appear to be his will. And wherever this is the prevailing disposition, it seems to me that *the seeds of holiness are sown in that soul*, though but small proficiency may be made in knowledge, and though the capacities for service may be very low.' (Doddridge on Regen. *Serm.* 8.)

ordinarily attended with very strong agitations—marked enough to be duly noticed, distinctly perceived and studied, but probably not attended, or at least not often attended, with deep gloom, or uncontrollable terrors of spirit. 3. After these two classes, we name those others among the converted—alas, there are too few of them—who, having gone into deep vice, or dishonourable courses, or, having persevered long and obstinately in worldliness, neglect, deadness to religion, see at last the error of their way, and turn to God before they have sinned past recovery. Here are the cases, in which strong feeling and agitation, perhaps amazement and terror, though of various degrees, are usually to be expected: for the more firmly men have riveted themselves to sin, the greater will be the struggle of their emancipation from it.

In applying the rule thus illustrated, it must be remembered, that the three classes we have assumed run into each other—some persons may begin the pious change *between* early childhood and early manhood,[1] and some between early manhood and the age when worldliness or wickedness have confirmed and entire sway. Of course the penitent feelings may be expected to vary, proportionally, from the several standards we have attempted to describe. We must repeat, also, that there will often be other undefinable variations from them, arising from difference of temperament especially, difference of habits,

1 'These operations, where there is a religious education, often begin very early: but then, in some degree, the impressions wear off from the weak and flexible mind; and perhaps there are various instances in which they alternately revive and decay again. And this vicissitude of affectionate applications to religion under moving ordinances, afflictions, or deliverances, and of backslidings and remissness in it, may .... with respect to many .... continue for a long time. At length, under the various methods of providence and grace, the soul arrives to greater steadiness, and a more habitual victory over the remainders of indwelling sin.' (Doddridge on Regeneration, *Serm.* 8.)

difference of education, difference in doctrinal views, and the differing influences of religious friends and companions.

But, besides a difference in the feelings which penitents undergo, there is a great difference in their taking notice of them, themselves respectively, and also in their disposition to speak of them to other persons.

Not all take the same notice of their feelings. Some, who have studied but little the nature of christian experience, will seldom examine their feelings, and seldom reflect upon them; and thus, what may actually have occurred within them will have been so imperfectly noticed, that they cannot give a clear or connected account of it.[1]— Others, who have heard these things much dwelt upon, will describe their feelings in ample detail, and sometimes perhaps with not a little unconscious exaggeration: and, in this spirit, those who have committed none of the grosser offences, or been obstinate in neglect, nay, those even who have been in the calmer walks of piety, may excite their hearts, and then magnify the agitations so produced, till they imagine the dark self-convictions of the greatest profligate. Now, both these classes of christians are, we doubt not, sincere; and, their faith and obedience being

1 'I will add, that christians of a very amiable and honourable character may express themselves but in a dark, and something of an improper manner, concerning the doctrine of regeneration, and may, in conscience, scruple the use of some phrases relating to it, which we judge to be exceeding suitable; and yet, that very scruple which displeases us may proceed from a reverence for God and truth, and from such a tenderness of heart as is the effect of his regenerating grace . . . . I remember good Dr. Owen, whose candour was, in many respects, very remarkable, carries this so far as somewhere to say, 'that some may, perhaps, have experienced the saving influences of the Holy Spirit on their hearts, who do not in words acknowledge the necessity, or even the reality of those influences.' Judging men's hearts, and judging their states, is a work for which we are so ill qualified, that we have reason to be exceeding thankful it is not assigned to us.' (Doddridge on Regen. *Serm.* 8.)

sound, they both rank as morally regenerate. But they both have their mistake; the former, the mistake of too much coldness; the latter, the mistake of an artificial fervour. We would not indeed have any one to be sparing of his penitent feelings: no, the spirit of self-justification is the spirit of delusion; and none but deep humility is genuine; none but that always tender humility before God, which bears constantly in mind the searching question, 'who can tell how oft he offendeth?' we only mean to say, that there is no scriptural authority for requiring those who have indeed sinned comparatively little, to undergo, through an over-anxious stimulation, the appalling terrors of those who have been hardened in carelessness or immersed in deep guilt.

Different also is the inclination to speak to others concerning our religious feelings. Some are naturally of a communicative disposition; others, naturally reserved—some converse freely of their ordinary feelings and ordinary affairs; others confine them very much within their own bosoms. It may often be the case, therefore, that two persons shall have undergone the same religious emotions, who yet do not appear to have done so: the silent man, indeed, may compare his own with those of the communicative, but of his nothing will be known. Here, of course, we are left entirely to the rule, which should always be the ultimate rule, of estimating character by the life. If the life be holy, we must believe the heart to have been made holy by grace. God only can discover whether it be otherwise. To men, who can but imperfectly search their own hearts, and much less those of others, the life is the only evidence within reach.[1]

1 Bp. Taylor remarks—'Religion is like the breath of heaven; if it goes abroad into the open air, it scatters and dissolves like camphire: but if it [be improved] in secret, it is strong and mighty, and comes forth with vigour and great effect in the days of death and judgment.' (Serm. *V.* 3. *p.* 296.)

We include then, among the morally regenerate, *all* christians whose principles and conduct afford the due evidence, whether their conception and description of the change be vivid or obscure—and also, whatever has been the process by which the Spirit has effected it—whether by the gentlest and most unperceived operations of grace, proving successful at the outset of life—or, by operations more marked, in those whose early years have been lost in sin, or worldliness, or neglect—or, by those strong conflicts which overcome the hardened offender. The test is holy living. In all the cases, there is the change from depravity to holiness, from the dominion of sin to victory over it. In all the cases, the duty of the font having been performed, the conditions of pardon through Christ, according to the covenant and seal of baptism, are so far made good; and the title will continue to be availing so long as this holy character, and the progress in holy character, are maintained.

To the same effect, Bp. Hopkins, of Raphoe—'As the ground that is fullest of precious mines, hath least grass growing upon it; so is it, many times, with the children of God in holy duties: where the heart is most full of grace, and where there are many precious affections in it stirring towards God, yet there are the least flourishings of expressions in their words.' (Works, *V.* 2. *p.* 516.) We quote these remarks, not to insinuate that the disposition to converse much on one's religious state is a reason for suspecting him, when there are the due practical tests; but only in defence of a valuable class of the brethren, who either have no such inclination, or, if they have, do not indulge it.

CHAPTER V.

THE THEORY OF THE TWO REGENERATIONS APPLIED TO THE STANDARDS AND OFFICES OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

SECTION I.

THE STANDARDS EXAMINED.

That the substance of this theory, a regeneration in baptism, insufficient for salvation without the change of the heart and affections, was held by the English Reformers who framed our standards and offices, there can be no doubt. Yet it is questionable whether their views of the *quæstio in hac re celata* were precise—may we not say so? —as they were appealed to on both sides in the controversy, some twenty or thirty years ago, in England. As even the Fathers wrote on the subject in a manner that requires theological analysis—be the theory of regeneration what it may—we do the Reformers no discredit, in supposing that they likewise might so present it as not to preclude further inquiry. As, also, various explanations are now given of the connexion of baptism with regeneration, so probably there were among the Reformers: and hence it may not always be clear, that any particular explanation of these parts of our Prayer-book, with reference to their opinions, excludes all others. With this qualifying remark—and we

see not how *any* expositor of that volume can reject it—we shall endeavour to show, that our key fits the standards and offices of the Episcopal church readily and without violence. We first look to the Standards: the reader will please take up his Prayer-book, and examine each passage as we proceed.

We turn to the Articles, and begin with the xxviith, on Baptism. 'Baptism is not only a sign [*signum*] of profession, and mark [*nota*] of difference, whereby christian men are discerned from others that be not christened: but it is also a sign [*signum*] of Regeneration or new birth.' This passage relates to what is proved or betokened by baptism: and it declares this rite to be evidence of three things—it is a 'sign' of the profession of christianity—it is a 'mark' distinguishing members of the visible church from others—and it is a 'sign' of regeneration: of course, there is the same proof, in that sacrament, that the baptized are regenerate, as that they are under their 'profession,' or receive the 'mark of difference' from the unbaptized; in other words, their baptism is the visible and full proof of their baptismal regeneration. We may argue the same point another way. The word 'sign,' here applied to baptism as a 'profession,' means obviously that it is absolute evidence of that profession, not a mere emblem of it, if there be such a thing: the same, of course, must that word, 'sign,' be presumed to mean, when applied, in the same sentence, to baptism as indicating 'regeneration;' it does not signify that the rite is a mere emblem of new birth, but the proof of its existence, just as it is the proof of the baptismal 'profession;' and it hence follows, that baptism is declared, in the Article, to be absolute evidence of a change which has the name 'regeneration or new birth:' if any deny this, on them lies the burden of proof. We proceed with this line of argument. Baptism is absolute evidence of a change called regeneration; but it is

not absolute evidence of the gift of grace to produce the holy change of character;[1] the baptismal change therefore must be something different. And this brings us to the baptismal regeneration we have described, the mere 'engrafting into the church,' and endowment with its privileges, as the Article immediately adds—'whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church.'

But it further adds a recognition of the *higher* regeneration we have mentioned, the moral new birth, under two of the synonymous expressions. The Article declares, that by this sign, baptism, 'the *promises* of the forgiveness of sin, and of our *adoption* to be the *sons of God* by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed.' Now, as we before intimated,[2] *that* regeneration, of the *actual* effecting of which baptism is complete and absolute evidence, cannot be the same as the regeneration *promised*, in that rite, under the equivalent language 'adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost.' The interpretation here, of the thing 'promised,' must be the same as in the passage we referred to relating to the Corinthians—of whom, though baptismally regenerate, St. Paul declared that they had the 'promise' that God would be a 'Father' to them, and that they should become his 'sons and daughters:'[3] they had the 'promise,' in other words, of moral regeneration, or further moral regeneration, the baptismal being theirs already. We regard, therefore, the 'adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost,' which the Article declares to be 'promised' in baptism, as the progressive moral change we have illustrated. The influence of the Spirit to produce the moral new birth, and to regenerate more and more those whose moral regeneration

[1] See *Chap.* IV. *Sect.* 4. of this Essay. [2] See *Chap.* III. *Sect.* 3. of this Essay. [3] 2 Cor. vii. 1. vi. 18: see *Chap.* III. *Sect.* 1. of this Essay.

has begun, is 'promised,' not peculiarly conferred, in that sacrament.

Should it be alleged, that this 'promised' regeneration means our resurrection and glorification in both soul and body—we reply that these are not, in any clear scripture, ascribed to the Holy Ghost especially; and therefore the Article, in speaking of our becoming 'sons of God by the Holy Ghost,' does not probably refer to them, but rather to our new heart and new spirit, which *are* produced by his peculiar influences. Should it be alleged, on the other hand, that this 'adoption to be the sons of God' means the baptismal 'regeneration' before mentioned in the Article —we further reply, that the mode of expression should then have been, 'the promises . . . . are visibly *fulfilled*,' instead of 'signed and sealed.' To sign and seal a 'promise' implies that it has yet to be made good. A promise fulfilled is no longer a promise; and its signature and seal then become empty, their function being discharged. The clause therefore cannot allude to baptismal regeneration, conferred absolutely at the font: it implies that there is *another* 'adoption,' which is there only 'promised' or covenanted for; and this can be none other than the moral adoption or regeneration, the change of character.

Our doctrine, then, appears to be more than a key to this Article; we think it is here recognised as the very doctrine of the church. Nor do we see how this claim can be refuted. Two regenerations are plainly set forth; of one of which baptism is the 'sign' or evidence; while of the other it is only the 'promise' or conditional title. And if any one of our Standards is to be regarded as of pre-eminent authority in this matter, it must be this Article, treating expressly of 'Baptism.'

The xxvth Article, in declaring that the sacraments have a 'wholesome effect in such only as worthily [*digne*] receive them,' means, as referring to baptism, not that the

sacramental regeneration of which that rite is the 'sign' or *absolute* evidence, may not take place at the font, but that the 'promised' and other *contingent* benefits of the ordinance are withheld from the unworthy. They must no longer resist the Holy Spirit, they must yield to his general influences moving within their souls, before they will ripen into his morally regenerating influences, and bring them to repentance and faith—before they will obtain or secure any of the greater blessings through Christ to which baptism is their covenant title.

The ixth Article declares that original sin, or the 'infection of nature doth remain, yea, [*etiam*,] in them that are *regenerated*;' which assertion is true of both the baptismally and the morally regenerate, but is most naturally interpreted of the latter. In a subsequent passage, it is declared, 'there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized,' that is, for the morally regenerate who are baptized—this rite being our covenant title to the pardon implied in the phrase 'no condemnation:' the Latin copy gives *renatis* for 'baptized,' but the translation is obviously correct; and the English is of equal authority.

The xvth Article says—'all we the rest (although [*etiam*] baptized and *born again* in Christ) yet offend in many things.' This assertion is true of those who are only baptismally regenerate; but it most naturally applies to those who are regenerate in both senses—even these 'offend in many things.'

The xvith Article, 'of sin after baptism,' contains two principal propositions. 1. 'Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost and unpardonable.' 2. 'After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God (we may) arise again, and amend our lives.' The first proposition means, in effect, that the baptized do not renounce their baptism, its regeneration

by the Spirit, its covenant title to pardon, by every wilful deadly sin. The second proposition may also have this meaning; but we prefer extending the signification of the phrases, 'received the Holy Ghost,' and 'grace given,' so as to include the moral regeneration of the baptized: the baptized, who also 'receive the Holy Ghost' in this sense, and thus have 'grace given' them, though they fall into sin, may yet arise and amend their lives, by the further 'grace of God' restoring their moral regeneration. And those are to be condemned, adds the Article, who say that the evil deeds of such persons are not sins; and those also who deny them forgiveness when they repent.

The xviith Article says, of those who are predestinated to life, that they are called, and obey the call, and are justified freely, and are 'made *sons* of God by *adoption*,' and are 'made like [*efficiuntur conformes*] the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ,' &c. The expression 'made sons of God by adoption' may have either interpretation—made sons of God by adoption, in baptism—or made sons of God by adoption, in the sense of moral regeneration. If either of the phrases 'called' or 'justified freely' means baptized, or includes baptism, the sonship and adoption cannot be the baptismal change. If not, the sonship and adoption must refer to baptism—for it can scarcely be that the Article omits all notice of that sacrament—and then the moral change of the elect is asserted in the clause, 'they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ.'

We next proceed to the Catechism. Each catechumen is taught that in baptism he was made 'a *child of God*, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,' and was 'called to a state of salvation:' this refers of course to only baptismal regeneration, the ecclesiastical change of 'state.'—A sacrament is said, in another part of the Catechism, to be

'an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace *given* unto us.' This language has two constructions—'given' absolutely, and 'given' conditionally. In the Lord's supper, the inward and spiritual grace, the reception of the body and blood of Christ, is 'given' only conditionally, only to the 'faithful.' Of the inward and spiritual grace of baptism, however, no such limitation is mentioned; and we therefore regard the 'death unto sin' and the 'new birth unto righteousness,' of which that sacrament is 'a means and pledge,' as having the lower interpretation, and signifying only becoming baptismally regenerate. That such is the meaning of the words, will appear on referring to the thanksgiving after the baptism of infants, which recognizes even infants as 'dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness:' this, in a moral sense, *they* cannot be; their death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness is only a translation from the world, which is the kingdom of 'sin,' to the kingdom of God, the church, which is the kingdom of 'righteousness.' And what those words mean in the case of infants, they must mean in all cases, since nothing is said of more than one kind of grace as 'given' in baptism.—We are further to notice, that the Catechism declares what is given to us in this sacrament to be 'an *inward* and *spiritual grace*'—it is not a merely external donation or distinction. To this declaration our theory fully conforms. Baptism confers a 'grace,' in conferring a title to all the blessings of the christian covenant—it confers an 'inward' grace, in conferring it on the souls of men; for the soul, the entire person, is ecclesiastically regenerated at the font—and it confers a 'spiritual' grace, because it is the Holy Spirit who, with human ministers as his agents, 'baptizes us into the one body,' the church, and so bestows the 'grace,' through which we are baptismally 'born of the Spirit,' and by

which 'God [through his Spirit] sets the members every one of them in that body.'[1]

The Homilies are among our Standards, as 'containing godly and wholesome doctrine'—a mode of expression which leaves the degree of their authority undetermined, but which precludes the rejection of their leading or more conspicuous doctrinal contents. In none of them, so far as we recollect, is there any mention of the regeneration of baptism, except in the Homily for the Nativity, where baptism is called, 'the fountain of the new birth;' and except also where is quoted the passage, 'unless a man be born anew, of water and the Spirit,' in the Homily for Whitsunday: that point they seem to have left to the Articles, Catechism, and Offices; for as all the people were then baptized in infancy, so that the Form of Adult Baptism was not set forth till long afterwards, there was little occasion, perhaps, for discourses on the subject. In the Homily for Whitsunday, with the slight exception mentioned, regeneration is every where regarded as a moral change. The only question, we suppose, is this—does the Homily presume the regeneration it speaks of to have been effected in baptism? We judge not: for, in the conclusion of the first Part, the baptized hearers are invited to join in a prayer thus expressed—'humbly beseeching him so to work in our hearts by the power of this Holy Spirit, that we being regenerate and newly born again in all goodness, righteousness, sobriety, and truth, may in the end be made partakers of everlasting life,' &c. The prayer is, that the Spirit may so work in the heart as to effect (or renew) the regeneration to holy character: this is the kind of grace here prayed for. And that this sort of grace was not already given in baptism, seems evident from the bap-

[1] See *Chap.* iii. *Sect.* 1.—and the *Note* at the conclusion of *Chap.* iii. *Sect.* 4—of this Essay.

tized being desired to pray for it: or, if the contrary be held, it must also be held, to agree at all with the Homily, that a moral regeneration is given in baptism, and that another moral regeneration may afterwards be given; yes, another and another, every time the Homily is read. We know of no divine who maintains such a theory[1]—neither is it a theology worth maintaining, so far as we can perceive—neither do we regard it as consonant with scripture. We conclude therefore, that though the Homilies say little of baptismal regeneration, they assert a moral new birth which is not effected in that sacrament.

CHAPTER V.—SECTION 2.

THE OFFICES EXAMINED.

In the Offices of Baptism, the repetition of our Lord's declaration to Nicodemus means of course what that declaration itself did—'none can enter the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost;' none can enter the heavenly church, except he be both baptismally and morally regenerate. The next passage, however, 'baptized with water and the Holy Ghost,' refers to baptismal regeneration only, since there is but 'one baptism,' and that 'by the Spirit.' The pas-

1 Those who consider baptismal regeneration as the implanting of a seed of moral grace, affirm that there is no other regeneration, none before, and none after baptism. Those again, who allow only one regeneration, and view it as a mere privilege, not an influence, once only to be conferred, and made complete in infants at the font, will recollect that all the congregation were, at that period, baptized in infancy, and were regenerate; and, on their theory, they were never again to be regenerated in this life: yet the Homily invites them to pray for a regeneration, and that of the moral kind—every Whitsunday.

sage in the second prayer, 'receive remission of sins by spiritual regeneration,' is also to be understood of the baptismal change only; the 'remission of sins' being elsewhere called 'the *mystical* [or sacramental] washing away of sin.' In the third prayer, 'give thy Holy Spirit .... that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation,' alludes only to baptismal regeneration: and so does 'bestow upon them the Holy Ghost,' in a paragraph just before this prayer, in the office for adults. With these petitions for the sacramental blessing, are combined others, for 'coming to the land of everlasting life,' for the 'everlasting benediction of the heavenly washing,' for 'coming to the eternal kingdom.' The petition, that 'the old Adam may be so buried that the new man may be raised up,' refers to moral regeneration; but it is not implied that it takes place in baptism, any more than that 'all sinful affections die, and all things belonging to the Spirit live and grow,' in the performance of that rite: besides, that petition is repeated after its performance, in the words, 'may crucify the old man;' and the duty is declared, near the close of the service, 'we, who are baptized, should die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness:' it is clear, therefore, that the regeneration expressed in these equivalent terms is not supposed to take place at the font —it is the moral kind. In other passages, however, each individual of the baptized is declared absolutely to be 'regenerate,' to be 'regenerated with the Holy Spirit,' and 'received for God's own child by adoption'—or, to be 'born again,' and 'made the child of God and of the light' —all which phrases must allude, of course, to baptismal regeneration only.

While on the offices of Baptism, it may be proper to state, that we deem them clear on the point—that a regeneration is *always* effected in that rite—whether the moral change be called by that name, or not. Each *indi-*

vidual, whether infant or adult, is declared to be 'regenerate.' This, as we have already intimated, is very different from the assertion that the church *generally*, as a body, is regenerate, sanctified, holy. A general assertion admits of exceptions; a particular one does not. We may say, the people of the United States are free, intelligent, and well educated; but we cannot declare this of each individual of the people—for there are millions of slaves, and many in prisons—besides that numbers of them are stupid, and can neither read nor write. What the church, therefore, declares of her individual members, she must mean fully and explicitly, without any reservation or hypothesis—*every* baptized person is baptismally regenerate, and is declared to be so the moment he is baptized.

One of the exhortations at the time of administering the Holy Communion has the words, 'that he might make us the children of God, and exalt us to everlasting life.' Either the baptismal covenant sense, or the moral sense, may be given to the phrase 'children of God;' or, indeed, both senses. Perhaps, however, its connexion with the rest of the passage, and the fully declared requisites for partaking worthily of the eucharist, give the preference to the construction which makes it signify morally regenerate.

In the Office for the Sick, the exhortation quotes the passage from the epistle to the Hebrews, 'whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth: if ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons.' The 'sons' who are 'received' by God, as distinguished from sons not received by him, are the morally regenerate. And the sick person is encouraged to endure and improve his affliction, with the hope that such is his character, sustained by the further hope, that God is 'chastening him for his profit, that he may be a partaker (more fully) of His holiness.'

In the Confirmation service, there is an allusion to regeneration; and, as confirmation is the repetition of the baptismal vow, and the maturing of the baptismal standing, we refer it to baptismal regeneration only—'hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins.' The language means, *unquestionably*, what is meant in the similar expressions that occur in the office for baptizing persons of riper years—the sacramental new birth, the sacramental forgiveness of sins.

In one other place allusion is made to regeneration, under that name—in the Collect for Christmas-day—and there also, we think, the baptismal sense must be given the words 'being regenerate and made thy children by adoption and grace.' Moral regeneration is prayed for in the next clause, 'may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit.'

In the Collect for the Circumcision, moral regeneration is prayed for in the words, 'grant us the *true circumcision* of the Spirit.' In that for Ash-Wednesday, the same is meant in the petition, *create* and *make* in us *new* and contrite hearts.' And in that for Easter-Even, the prayer that 'by continual *mortifying* our corrupt affections, we may be *buried* with Christ,' is to similar effect. All these expressions signify moral regeneration—as do likewise these others—'*give* us an *heart* to love and fear thee'—'*put* upon us the armour of *light*'—'*turn* thou us, O good Lord, and so shall we be *turned*'—'*graft* in our hearts the love of thy name.' And all these prayers, besides the others in which we ask for grace in more general terms, recognise both the frequent repetition of our moral new birth, and its continual increase.

The Collect for the sixth Sunday after the Epiphany has an expression, to which may be assigned either or all of the three meanings—regenerate in baptism, morally re-

generate, regenerate in heavenly glory—'whose blessed Son was manifested that he might .... make us the sons of God, and heirs of eternal life.' The words may signify—the sons of God by the sacramental new birth, and heirs of eternal life by the consequent sacramental title—the sons of God by the change to a sanctified heart, and heirs having this 'earnest' of our eternal inheritance—the sons of God being the children of the resurrection, and heirs taking possession of eternal life. The Son of God was manifested for all these purposes, and either may be the sense of this beautiful Collect. Nor do we perceive any objection to keeping the whole three interpretations in mind when offering it up: rightly understood, the language is thus rich and comprehensive, and will fully sustain this intermingled devotional effusion of pious thoughts. It resembles, in this respect, the petition, 'thy kingdom come,' in the Lord's prayer—thy kingdom, the visible church; may it extend and be completed—thy kingdom in our hearts; may they be more and more surrendered to thy gracious dominion—thy kingdom in eternity; hasten its coming, O Lord God!

CONCLUSION.

Our main discussion having expanded itself into some collateral investigations, it may be proper, in concluding, to bring again the subjects of the former into clear notice. We remind the reader, therefore, that we have endeavoured to prove—that Scripture recognises the *two* regenerations, to the change of *state*, and to the change of *character*—that the former is the mere separation to the visible *church* estate, and its privileges, especially the great privilege of the covenant *title* to pardon, grace, and glory, and is, under the gospel, effected in *baptism*, and by the *Holy Spirit*, being independent however of all his converting influences—and that the latter change, includes the whole *sanctifying* process, by which the heart is reclaimed from its natural love of depravity, and restored from its natural subjection to it, the principles and conduct made holy, and the baptismal *title made good* to pardon and acceptance with God. Both the regenerations, and all their benefits, are vouchsafed to us through the merits only of the Redeemer.

As a defence of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in applying the word regeneration to baptism, this essay need scarcely perhaps be offered. There are several theories sufficient for that purpose; most, if not all christian denominations speak of the sacrament of the font in similar terms; and no well informed divine raises the objection, unless when he degrades himself to the work of a caviller. To those, however, who from want of information speak evil of us in this matter, these pages are respectfully submitted.

As furthering a theological analysis of matters worthy of solution—as an exposition of scriptural truth, clearer, in our apprehension, than those commonly held on the subject of regeneration, our remarks will not, we hope, be without value.

As setting forth, on secure grounds, not liable to either misapprehension or the imputation of extravagance, the high character of baptism, as our introduction, by the Holy Spirit, into the covenant of God's mercy through Christ, with the exalted appellation and privileges of sons of God, our argument and illustrations may prove seasonable; for the tendency of the present age is to depreciate the ordinances.

As furnishing, from scripture, a class of very strong topics for the conversion of the sinner, and the restoration of the erring disciple—without detracting from the regenerating and spiritual grace of baptism—we take the liberty of recommending our views of the moral new birth. They offer 'reproof, rebuke, and exhortation,' to such persons from the many scriptures which require them to be morally 'born of God;' which assure them, that without holy graces and virtues they are *not* morally the 'children of God,' but, though baptismally regenerate, the 'children of the devil;' and which announce to them the consolations of 'the Spirit of [the moral] adoption,' when he 'beareth witness with the spirit' of those in whom he dwells. What pleas more urgent and more insinuative can be addressed to men!

As affording the encouragements to persevere, and the holy comforts, which flow from the humble persuasion of being morally the sons of God—of being embraced in his deepest paternal affection—of being sustained by his paternal hand—our doctrine will, we believe, be further beneficial. Such considerations have a powerful sway in the pious bosom.

As exposing the very mistaken opinion, that the moral new birth is to be *tested* by strong feelings, we hope that our paragraphs on that subject will prove advantageous.

And, should our instruction correct the opposite mistake —we hope there are few that hold it—that there is *no* moral regeneration, no absolute *change* of nature from depravity to holiness, producing a *new* nature in us—that there is no *such* a renewal, gradual or speedy, according to the several cases, early or deferred, gentle or severe, from the mere buds of sinfulness, or from its fruits, expanding, ripening, ripe, or ripest—that there is no change of this sort, required in *each* and *every* human being, past childhood, and of sane mind—should so dark an error be counteracted by this little work, the author will thank the Father of mercies, that his labours have had so great a blessing.

APPENDIX.

REGENERATION SYNONYMOUS WITH RENOVATION OR NEW CREATION.

THE distinction between Regeneration and Renovation we deem factitious—the former word having its critical sense. The distinction is of course factitious, if the moral sense be allowed to that word. True; arbitrary definitions may be given to the two designations, and they may stand for what we have called baptismal regeneration and moral regeneration: and if this were the whole result of appropriating those terms, it would be but a verbal contest to question it. But the question has a bearing on the interpretation of many scriptures, and may be extended to matters of practical theology. We deem it therefore worthy of as full an investigation as we are able to give it.

We introduce this topic with a quotation from the pamphlet of Dr. Jarvis, already referred to in the essay—this Sermon, with the Appendix, we recommend to all who wish to understand the point in discussion. He says —'A distinction has of late years been made by many able divines between the terms regeneration and renovation; but it deserves to be seriously considered, whether this distinction is well founded; and whether it is not likely to produce the same confusion of thoughts, and the same interminable disputes, which have arisen from the opposite limitation of the new birth, to the incipient sanctification of the soul.'[1]

It has been argued, in the essay, (*Ch.* iv. *sect.* 1,) that as our natural birth or begetting is our only natural creation, the two are equivalent, and that therefore our new

[1] Dr. Jarvis' Serm. and Append. *p.* 72.

birth and new creation must be equivalent also. And we think this argument settles the point before us, so far as it can be decided by obvious reason, or justness of definition. But this consideration may be greatly strengthened, by showing that Scripture recognises the equivalency of the expressions, born and created, and the like. And as custom, not always reason, is the law of language, it will be proper to inquire how custom or use, among writers uninspired, determines the case. To Scripture then—and to human authorities—we refer.

1. Scripture uses birth for natural creation in the passage, 'Before the mountains were *brought forth*'—also, by construction, in the clause, 'before the *hills* was I *brought forth*.' It uses also creation for natural birth, 'The Lord that *made* thee, and *formed* thee from the *womb*'—again, 'he that *formed* thee from the *womb*'—again, 'thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are *created*,' i. e. new generations of creatures are *born*. Natural birth and natural creation are used also as synonymous, 'This shall be written for the *generation* to come: and the people which shall be *created* shall praise the Lord:' so convertible indeed are the ideas, that the Prayer-book translation of this verse gives 'born' for 'created.' To the same effect, St. Paul argues, that, as God 'hath *made* of one blood all nations of men,' they 'are the *offspring* of God:'[1] his relation as Father of all, and Creator of all, is one and the same.

We find also, in Scripture, that *new* birth and *new* creation are synonymous—as in the passages, 'Bring my *sons* from far, and my *daughters* from the ends of the earth; even every one that is called by my name: for I have *created* him for my glory, I have *formed* him, yea, I have *made* him'—again, 'Of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that *formed* thee'—again, 'Let Israel rejoice in him that *made* him; let the *children* of Zion be joyful in their king'—again, 'Have we not all one *Father?* hath not one God *created* us? why do we.... profane the *covenant* of our fathers?'—again, 'Thus saith the Lord, the Holy one of Israel, and his *Maker*, Ask me of things to come concerning my *sons;* and concerning

[1] Ps. xc. 2. Prov. viii. 25. Isa. xliv. 2. 24. Ps. civ. 30. cii. 18. Acts xvii. 26, 29.

the *work of my hands* command ye me.' The same key will apply to all passages which regard the Deity as the Creator, in a peculiar sense, of Israel, or of christians—'the *Creator* of Israel'—'we are his *workmanship, created* in Christ Jesus unto good works:"[1] the meaning is the same as—the Father of Israel; we are his children by regeneration.

The repeated prayers of the psalmist to be 'quickened'[2] are, in effect, prayers for moral regeneration. He had been already 'quickened,' yet he asks the same blessing again, and continually. This prayer not only intimates that moral regeneration is to be repeated, but also that it is the same as new creation, the 'renewing' which advances or is reiterated 'day by day.' The prayer-book translation says, in several places, 'quicken me, as thou art *wont*.'

We do not dwell on these passages, as their bearing on the point we are investigating seems clear. They afford, we think, ample scriptural proof that to be made anew and to be new born are expressions entirely equivalent. And as Scripture is the final authority in matters of doctrine, we might here rest the argument, and claim a decision in our favour. But, to show that our opinion is sustained by those of other writers, and that the law of custom declares for this convertibility of the terms, we proceed to the other head proposed.

2. Human authorities, almost without number, acknowledge, in various ways, the identity of regeneration and renovation or new creation. We draw our proofs from the Fathers, and from later divines.

Barnabas. In a passage of which we have already quoted a part, he says—'seeing therefore he has *renewed* ανακαινισας us by the remission of our sins, he has put us into another frame, that we should have souls like those of children,' &c.[3] The word 'renewed' here refers to baptism, which is the sacramental 'remission of sins.' And

1 Isa. xliii. 6, 7. Deut. xxxii. 18. Ps. cxlix. 2. Mal. ii. 10. Isa. xlv. 11. xliv. 15. Eph. ii. 10: the margin of a Scotch edition of the Bible refers, at this last passage, to John iii. 3, 5.

2 Ps. lxxx. 18. cxix. 25, 37, 40, 88, 149, 154, 156, 159. cxliii. 11: see Bp. Horne on Ps. cxix. 25.

3 Barn. Epist. *sect.* 6.

as baptism is commonly regarded as regeneration, by the fathers, and indeed as no other meaning can here be assigned the word, it follows that the 'renewing' of this passage is synonymous with the regeneration of the font.—The 'putting us into another frame,' and 'forming us again,' refer to moral regeneration.

Justin Martyr. We will state also in what manner we are *created anew* καινοποιηθεντες by Christ, and have dedicated ourselves to God .... we lead them to a place where there is *water*, and there they are *regenerated* αναγεννωνται as we also were.'[1] It is evident that renewing or new creation, baptism, and regeneration, were held synonymous by Justin—and were thus understood currently.

Athanasius. Referring to the expression (Heb. vi.) '*renew* them again unto repentance,' this father says—'he declares that there is one *renovation* by baptism, not a second .... the baptized person is *renewed*, as *born again* by the grace of the Spirit.'[2] The words 'renewed' and 'born again' are expressly made equivalent. And 'renovation by baptism,' or baptismal renovation, is obviously the same as baptismal regeneration. Whether referring the passage to baptism is its just interpretation, it is not our province to inquire. Again: We have quoted from this father the declaration, 'he who is baptized puts off the old man, and is *renewed*, as being *born again* by the grace of the Spirit'—to be 'renewed' and to be 'born again' are interchangeable expressions.

Gregory of Nyssa. 'We receive a salutary [new] *birth* by the *renovation* and change of our nature.'[3] Moral regeneration and moral renovation are plainly made the same thing.

Ambrose. 'St. Ambrose, speaking of baptism, expresses himself thus: By baptism we are *renewed*, by which also we are *born again*.'[4] If we understand the passage, renovation is here identified with new birth.

Augustine. 'The *renovation* after the image of God is

1 Just. Apol. (Press Edit.) *sect.* 79. *p.* 183.

2 Suicer on Ανακαινωσις. In Bp. Hobart's Bible, on Tit. iii. 5. one of the writers quoted allows that 'sometimes indeed renovation is used for the new birth, as Heb. vi. 4, 6.'

3 Suicer on Ανακαινισμος.

4 See Dr. Nicholls, in Bp. Brownell's Prayer-book.

not effected in a moment, like *that regeneration* in baptism, which is done in a moment.' We have quoted the passage twice in the essay. It shows that Augustine considered renovation and regeneration as synonymous—may we not say, in both the baptismal and the moral senses of those words respectively? May we not regard this passage as an adumbration of our entire doctrine?

On the authority then of the Fathers, we may securely affirm regeneration and renovation to be identical. And hence, according to the developements of our essay, renovation or new creation may, like regeneration, be regarded as of two kinds, baptismal renovation, and moral renovation. The results we need not point out, further than to suggest, that a certain text may be read four ways with the same meaning—washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost—washing of renewing, and regeneration of the Holy Ghost—washing of regeneration, and regeneration of the Holy Ghost—washing of renewing, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.

The following statement of the mode of speaking of the Fathers, on this subject, is from a standard writer on the Liturgy. 'The Greeks have a variety of words to express *regeneration* by: not only αναγεννησις, which is an exact translation of it; but ανακαινισμος, *renovation;* ανακτισις, *re-creation;* ἀνανεωσις, *renewing;* αναστασις, *resurrection;* μεταβολη, the change; μεταποιησις, the refitting; παλιγγενεσια, the being *born again;* παλιντοκια, the *begetting again:* all which expressions are used of baptism, and seldom or never of the rise after a lapse.'[1] That some of these expressions *are* applied by the Fathers to the moral change, and even to the rise after a lapse, we have shown in ch. iv. sect. 2. We produce the extract only to confirm our proposition, that regeneration and renovation are perfectly convertible modes of expression.

By referring to Suicer's Thesaurus, further evidence, drawn from the Fathers, will be found that these expressions are synonymous. The word Παλιγγενεσια, regeneration, he defines, 'to be *born again* or *renewed.*' Of the word Ανακαινισμος, renovation, he says, 'It is frequently used for baptism, which seals to us regeneration by the Spirit . . . .

[1] Dr. Nichols, as quoted in Bp. Brownell's Prayer-book.

hence the laver of *regeneration* is called *renovation* by the laver.' Of the word Ανακαινιζειν he says, 'it means to *renew*; it is elegantly used for *regeneration*.' On Ανανεωσις—'it means *renovation*, restoration, *regeneration*.' On Αναπλασις—'among ecclesiastical writers, it means *new formation*, *regeneration*, which is effected in baptism: or *simply* regeneration, which is effected by the Holy Ghost.' But we need not multiply quotations. It will be sufficient to add, with Dr. Jarvis, who first, we believe, among late writers, invited attention to this department of the subject of regeneration—this work contains 'full proof that the words resurrection, renovation, and regeneration, were, in a metaphorical sense, used anciently as convertible terms.'

'Hesychius explains Παλιγγενεσια regeneration, as meaning to be *born again* or *renewed*.'

Parkhurst, on Παλιγγενεσια, says—'a being born again, a new birth, *regeneration*, *renovation*'—again, on Matt. xix. 28, 'if the words εν τη παλιγγενεσια [in the *regeneration*] be construed as in our translation . . . they will denote that great spiritual *renovation* which began to take place on the preaching of John the Baptist . . . . . but if those words be connected . . . with the subsequent ones οταν καθισῃ, &c., they may then be most easily and naturally referred to that greater and more signal *renovation* which commenced after the resurrection and ascension of the Redeemer,' &c.

A host of divines of the church of England may be adduced in confirmation of the identity of renewing and the new birth.

Archbishop Cranmer says—'whosoever cometh to that *water*, being of the age of discretion, must examine himself duly, lest if he come unworthily, (none otherwise than he would unto other common water,) he be not *renewed* in Christ, but instead of salvation receive his damnation.'[1] Baptism duly received and 'renewing' are here connected; and this makes the 'renewing' the same as regeneration.

Bishop Taylor says—'Baptism is a *new birth*, by which we enter the new world, the *new creation*'—'and because from henceforward we are a *new creation*, the church uses to assign new relations to the catechumens, spiritual *fathers*

1 J. Scott on Bapt. *p.* 182.

and susceptors.'[1] Again—'the natural man cannot choose but do evil; but it is because he will do so; he is not born in the *second birth*, and *renewed* in the baptism of the Spirit.' Again—'so hath God done in the *new creation*; all the world was concluded under sin, it was a corrupt mass, all mankind had corrupted themselves; but yet were capable of divine influences, and of a nobler *form*, producible in the *new birth*: here then God's Spirit moves upon the *waters* of a divine *birth*,' &c.[2] He speaks of the baptismal new birth, and regards it as a new creation or renovation.

Bishop Pearson—'which *regeneration* is, as it were, a second *creation*, for we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works .... and he alone who did create us out of nothing, can *beget* us *again*, and make us of the *new creation*.' Again—'The *second* part of the office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man, is the *regeneration* and *renovation* of him ... [then are quoted Tit. iii. 5, John iii. 5, 1 Cor. vi. 11; and it is added] ... The *second* part then of the office of the Holy Ghost is the *renewing* of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul ..... If we live in the Spirit, *quickened* by his *renovation*, we must also walk in the Spirit.'[3] He makes 'renewing' include 'regeneration and renovation;' and he regards 'renovation' as that which 'quickens' the sinner, his resurrection, or new begetting.

Dr. Barrow says—'In baptism, the gift of God's Holy Spirit is conferred ..... with the laver of *regeneration* St. Paul joineth the *renovation* of the Holy Ghost.' Again: 'With those gifts [in baptism] is connected the benefit of *regeneration*, implying our entrance into a new state and course of life; being endowed with new faculties, dispositions and capacities of souls, becoming *new creatures* and new men, as it were *renewed* after the likeness of God in righteousness and true holiness,' &c. Again: he speaks of 'that work which is styled the *regeneration*, *renovation*, vivification, *new creation*, resurrection of man.'[4]

Archbishop Tillotson says—'sometimes the condition of

[1] Taylor's Life of Christ, *part* 1, *sect.* 9. We take these two extracts from Bishop Mant; who, if we mistake not, appropriates the term 'conversion,' oftener and indeed rather than renovation, to the moral change.
[2] Taylor's Serm. *V.* 3. *p.* 42, 303. [3] Pearson on the Creed, *p.* 27, 328.
[4] Weller Tracts, *p.* 11, 12: Works, *V.* 2. *Serm.* 34.

the gospel is expressed by ..... repentance, conversion, *regeneration*, *renovation*, sanctification, the *new creature* [or creation,] the new man.'[1]

Bishop Burnet. 'Our Saviour had this ordinance in his eye, when he spake to Nicodemus, and told him that except a man were *born again*, he could not see the kingdom of God: by which he meant the entire change and *renovation* of a man's mind,' &c. Again: 'our Saviour answered more fully, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be *born* of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. The meaning of which seems to be this, that except a man came to be *renewed*, by an ablution like the baptism which the Jews used, that imported the outward profession of a change of doctrine and of heart; and with that, except he were inwardly changed by a secret power called the Spirit, that should transform his nature, he could not become one of his disciples, or a true christian.'[2] In the former of these extracts, 'renovation' is made the same as being 'born again.' In the latter, 'renewed' corresponds with being 'born of water,' while the operation of 'the Spirit' appears to be regarded as a different change, though a part of the same regeneration. A critic might see two renovations in these passages.

Dr. Whitby—'except a man be *born again*, that is, *renewed* in his mind, will, and affections, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and so become a *new creature*.' Again—'hath quickened us together with Christ, not only by giving us a *new birth*, or *renovation* of life, but an assurance also of eternal life.'[3]

Bishop Hopkins, of Raphoe—'There is indeed a baptismal *regeneration*, whereby all that are made partakers of that ordinance, are, according to scripture language, sanctified, *renewed*, and made the children of God.'[4]

Bishop Bradford adverts, as we have seen in the essay, to the 'true notion of *regeneration*, both when it is applied to baptism, and when it particularly denotes the *renewing* of the mind by the Divine Spirit.'

1 Tillotson *V.* 2. *p.* 325.
2 On the xxviith Article.
3 Whitby on John iii. 3. Eph. ii. 5: as quoted in Bp. Hobart's Bible.
4 Hopkins' Works, *V.* 2. *p.* 468.

Stackhouse, we have shown, (*ch.* iv. *sect.* 6,) makes regeneration and renewing synonymous.

Dr. Waterland, as quoted in our essay, (*ch.* iv. *sect.* 5,) allows that *regeneration*, 'in the larger sense, takes in *renovation*.'

Dr. Hole, on the gospel for Trinity Sunday, says ..... 'God the Holy Ghost, who moving upon the waters of *baptism*, effects a *new creation*, as he did by moving upon the face of the waters in the old creation.' By ascribing the 'new creation' or renovation to 'baptism,' he makes it the same as regeneration.

Dean Comber—'As it was in the first *creation* and *generation* of all things, so is it in the *new creation* and *regeneration* of a christian: the Spirit moving upon the waters of *baptism*, giveth light and life,' &c. Again—'our corrupt nature is changed in *baptism*, and there is a *renovation* effected thereby, both as to the mortification of the old affections, and the quickening of the new, by the Holy Spirit, which is hereby given to all that put no bar or impediment to it.'[1] Renovation effected in baptism is of course the same as baptismal regeneration.

Dr. Bennett—'To be born of water signifies, to be baptized with water; and to be *born* of the Spirit signifies to be *renewed* in the inner man, to be sanctified or made holy by the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit. And this birth of water and of the Spirit is a new birth, and is distinguished from that old former birth of nature by which we enter into the world.'[2] This writer comes very near making two new births. He certainly makes regeneration by the Spirit to be synonymous with renovation.

Wheatly—'when we are admitted into the church we are first *baptized*, whereby the Holy Ghost cleanses us from the pollutions of our sins, and *renews* us unto God,' &c. Again—'those who are dead to God through sin, are *born again* by the washing of regeneration, and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost.' Again—'this new name is given us at our baptism, to remind us of our *new birth*, when, being washed in the laver of *regeneration*, we are thereby cleansed from

1 Quoted in Bp. Brownell's Prayer-book.
2 See Bp. Brownell's Prayer-book.

our natural impurities, and become in a manner *new creatures.*'[1]

Skelton—'it had been far better for them never to have been, than not to have been reclaimed and *regenerated;* because, without their *second creation*, the first must have put them unavoidably in the way of everlasting misery.'[2]

Bishop Horne—'The first portion of sanctifying grace is given at *baptism* .... the sinner being then sacramentally buried with Christ into his death, arises with him .... *renewed* unto holiness by the operation of his Spirit. This total *renewal*, as first conferred by the baptismal laver, is styled *regeneration*, and answers, in things natural, to the birth of an infant.'[3]

Dr. Paley says of repentance—'it is called in scripture, a state of *regeneration*, or *new birth;* a conversion from sin to God; a being *renewed* in the spirit of our minds; a putting off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts of the flesh, and a putting on the new man, which is *created* in righteousness and true holiness.'[4]

Bishop Porteus, on Matt. xix. 28, says—'Our translators .... supposed that word [regeneration] to relate to the first preaching of the gospel, when those who heard and received it were to be *regenerated*, or made *new creatures.*'

Bishop J. B. Sumner, in a note on the same passage, containing the word '*regeneration*,' says—'In the *renovation* or restoration of all things.'

Bishop Ravenscroft—'In the primitive church, immediately after the days of the apostles, the word baptism was hardly ever used, but instead thereof some word which expressed its spiritual accompaniments—such as *regeneration*, *re-creation*, *renovation*, resurrection, *renewal*, with many others.'[5] All these therefore were convertible terms, and were equivalent to each other in meaning.

[1] Wheatly on the Office of Baptism. In the second of these extracts, an approximation may be seen to the doctrine of two regenerations; the one being 'the washing of regeneration;' the other, the being 'born again' by that regeneration together with the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost.' In another passage, Wheatly says, of 'born again to God,' that it is 'a phrase, which in most ecclesiastical writers, and especially in Irenæus, is generally used to signify *that* regeneration, which is the effect of baptism.'

[2] See Bp. Hobart's Bible, on John iii. 6.

[3] Discourse xviii. on Eph. iv. 7. (*Lond.* 1824, *p.* 224.)

[4] Paley's Clerg. Comp. (Works, *V.* 5. *p.* 311.) [5] Works, *V.* 1. *p.* 476.

Besides these authorities from our own denomination, for this identity of regeneration and renovation or new creation, we adduce some from the non-episcopal school.

Calvin—'I apprehend repentance to be *regeneration*... the apostle teaches us .... be ye *renewed* in the spirit of your mind.' Again—'in the whole course of *regeneration*, we are justly styled God's *workmanship*, *created* unto good works.'[1]

Baxter, as quoted in our essay—we are 'made *new creatures*, when we are baptized; therefore it is called the laver of *regeneration*.'

Matthew Henry, on Tit. iii. 5.—'Here is the formal cause of salvation, or that wherein it lies, the beginnings of it at least, in *regeneration*, or spiritual *renewing*, as it is here called.'

Doddridge, in his sermon on Tit. iii. 5, 6—'the apostle Paul here adds, that we are saved by the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost: by which I can by no means understand something entirely distinct from, and subsequent to his *regenerating* influences; for .... none can be *regenerated* who are not *renewed*.'

Campbell, on Matth. xix. 28, gives 'renovation' for regeneration—'ye which have followed me, in the regeneration,' &c. He adds, 'a *renovation*, or *regeneration*, of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new.'

Macknight, on Tit. iii. 5, says—'the real change in the nature of a believer, which entitles him to be called a *son of God*, is not effected by baptism, but by the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost.' In other words, regenerating grace is renewing grace—the two are identical—of course, the words regenerate and renew mean the same thing.

If then custom, the law of language, is to decide, we may securely affirm that regeneration and renovation are equivalent terms, are expressions perfectly interchangeable. Some writers indeed give the words distinct meanings. But we have, on the other side, Fathers, critics, and learned divines, too numerous to be overmatched. We have also in our favour, the Scriptures. We have, moreover, the reason of the thing—the natural sameness of the birth and the creation of men.

[1] Calv. Instit. *V.* 2. *p.* 73, 88.

Many of the passages we have quoted, from uninspired authors, are built on the theory, that the seed or first element of the moral and converting influences of the Spirit is deposited at baptism: that opinion we have disclaimed. Some, also, of the quotations, present a mode of speaking singularly incautious, and very liable to misrepresentation and perversion: indeed we have been astonished, while transcribing them, that Bishop Mant should have been so much upbraided for his comparatively unobjectionable tracts, while these earlier writings were not recalled to notice for yet greater censure. With this further disclaimer, concerning the tone of some of our extracts, we remind the reader, that we have adduced them merely to sustain our proposition, that renewing or new creation is synonymous with regeneration.

We know of but one objection to this part of our theory. It is alleged, that when Scripture and our Prayer-book use the words regenerate and renew in an *appropriate* or distinctive sense, the former means conferring the baptismal, and the latter the moral change. But the question is, *does* the scripture, or *does* our prayer-book, give an appropriate sense to these words? We think not—and for these reasons: 1. There is but one passage, in each of the books, in which this appropriate sense can even be supposed; 'the washing of *regeneration*, and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost;' 'grant that we, being *regenerate*, may daily be *renewed*;'[1] and one passage only is not sufficient to establish or to denote usage: this appropriation therefore of the respective words is taken for granted, not proved. 2. If we go beyond the very words to their synonymes, we find that scripture often applies to the moral change expressions equivalent to regeneration, as our essay has largely shown; and we find that 'renew' in Heb. vi. is by some interpreted of the regeneration of baptism; nay, we find some incorporate with it the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost,' in Tit. iii. We also find, that our Article xxvii. speaks of a regeneration or new birth' of which baptism is the 'sign' or token, and of an 'adoption to be the sons of God' which is only 'promised' in that sacrament. These facts show that the *sense* of the two words in question is

[1] Tit. iii. 5; and the Collect for Christmas day.

not appropriated, as alleged; and this affords the strongest presumption that the words *themselves* are not, in either scripture or the prayer-book. 3. The argument for this appropriation depends, not only on those books, but also on the interpretation of them by good authorities; and we have adduced enough of these, in behalf of our views, to neutralise, at the least, the authorities that are against us. We conclude therefore, that *neither* Scripture nor the Prayer-book use the words regeneration and renewing in an appropriated sense. Individual divines may do so, if they think fit, for their own arguments and illustrations; but private usage is widely different from the establishment of an usage by scripture or the church.

Our proposition then we regard as beyond fair objection —renewing or new creation and regeneration are terms equivalent and convertible.

The chief, though not the only bearing of this proposition, of this fact, as far as our essay is concerned, is on the further proposition, that moral regeneration is a progressive change, capable of increase and repetition. We must be 'renewed or morally regenerated *day by day*.' Daily must we 'put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.' We must 'come out from among' sinners, and from sin, continually, that God may be more and more 'a Father to us,' and we more and more 'his sons and his daughters.' And if we fall into great sin, compromitting or forfeiting our moral new birth, we must, like David beseech our Maker to 'create or *again* regenerate in us a clean heart.' So likewise must the pastor, who believes that he has been the instrument of the moral new birth of any of his flock—should he have reason to fear that they have swerved from this holy change—'travail in birth for them *again*,' yes, again and again, till he may trust that 'Christ is formed in them,' that they are steadily 'changing into the image of the Lord, from glory to glory.'

Let such improvement be made of the principle maintained in this Appendix, and the value of that principle will be established, beyond reasonable dispute. As the necessity of the moral new birth is the strongest of all topics in changing a sinner, so the necessity of the perpetual *continuance* of this regenerating process, or of its *re-*

BT
790
.O58

Onderdonk, H.U.
An essay on regeneration.

473843